



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Food and  
Nutrition  
Service

Office of  
Analysis and  
Evaluation

## Food Stamp Program Operations Study

---

# State and Local Claims Collection Operations

## STATE AND LOCAL CLAIMS COLLECTION OPERATIONS

**Prepared for the Office of Analysis and Evaluation by:**

**Prime Contractor:**

**Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.**  
600 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Suite 550  
Washington, D.C. 20024-2512

**Subcontractors:**

**Abt Associates, Inc.**  
**The Urban Institute**

**Authors:** Sharon K. Long  
Linda A. Wray

This study was sponsored by the Office of Analysis and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, as part of its ongoing

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report represents a team effort in which many individuals, in addition to the authors, made key contributions. We gratefully acknowledge their assistance. In particular, we would like to recognize the contribution to the project of Boyd Kowal, Jill Herndon, and Chris Kissmer of the Food and Nutrition Service. The state census interviews were skillfully administered by Sue Poppink, Regina Yudd, Cathy Casserly, and Marjorie McMahon; the local FSA survey interviews were diligently administered by the census interviewers, plus Glynis Daniels and Julie Daft. Sharon Hirabayashi and Andrew Ross constructed the data base and prepared the tables for the census component of the report. Harold Beebout and Alan Hershey provided useful comments and suggestions at various stages of the analyses. Thomas Good capably edited the report. Finally, Sharon Corbin-Jallow and Lucia Wesley cheerfully typed the tables and preliminary and final reports.

## CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	ix
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. GOALS OF THE CENSUS AND SURVEY OF CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESSES.....	2
B. SAMPLE AND INTERVIEWING METHODS.....	4
C. SCOPE OF REPORTED RESULTS.....	11
D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT.....	14
II. DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	17
A. OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	18
B. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	23
C. AUTOMATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS...	29
D. MANAGEMENT OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS...	32
E. DETECTION OF OVERISSUANCES.....	46
F. INVESTIGATION OF OVERISSUANCES.....	48
G. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CLAIM.....	53
H. COLLECTION OF PAYMENTS ON THE CLAIM.....	55
I. CLAIMS SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION.....	61
J. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	66
III. IDENTIFICATION OF DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES.....	73
A. DEFINING THE DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES.....	73
B. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	77
C. RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	85
IV. NATIONAL OVERVIEW OF CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS...	89
A. SELECTION OF THE LOCAL FSA SAMPLE.....	89
B. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	90
C. AUTOMATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS...	93
D. MANAGING THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	95
E. ISSUES FOR FURTHER ASSESSMENT.....	102
REFERENCES.....	107



CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

APPENDIX A - CHAPTER II SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES.....	A-1
APPENDIX B - CHAPTER III SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES.....	B-1
APPENDIX C - THE SURVEY SAMPLE DESIGN.....	C-1
APPENDIX D - CLAIMS COLLECTION CENSUS INSTRUMENT.....	CS-1
APPENDIX E - CLAIMS COLLECTION SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	CS-B-1

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE II.1 - STRUCTURE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	19
FIGURE III.1 - THREE-WAY CLASSIFICATION OF STATE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESSES.....	84

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE II.1	- LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR OPERATING THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	24
TABLE II.2	- USE OF SPECIALIZED STAFF IN THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	25
TABLE II.3	- SUMMARY OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE FOOD STAMP CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS WITH THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESSES OF OTHER PROGRAMS.....	27
TABLE II.4	- FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY THE AUTOMATED CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	30
TABLE II.5	- STAGES OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS COVERED BY ROUTINE SUMMARY REPORTS.....	34
TABLE II.6	- STAGES OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS COVERED BY ROUTINE REPORTS ON THE STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL CASES.....	35
TABLE II.7	- GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF ROUTINE SUMMARY AND STATUS REPORTS.....	36
TABLE II.8	- EXTENT AND EMPHASIS OF STAFF TRAINING IN THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	38
TABLE II.9	- ESTABLISHED TIME LIMITS FOR PROCESSING CLAIMS BY THE STAGE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	40
TABLE II.10	- CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRACKING SYSTEMS USED TO MONITOR INDIVIDUAL CASES IN THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	41
TABLE II.11	- CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEMS USED TO SIGNAL STAFF THAT A CASE NEEDS FURTHER ATTENTION.....	43
TABLE II.12	- CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEMS USED TO SORT CLAIMS BY THEIR CHRONOLOGICAL AGE.....	45

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

TABLE II.13 - FREQUENCY OF USE AND RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE METHODS USED TO DETECT OVERISSUANCES.....	47
TABLE II.14 - ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE INVESTIGATION STAGE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	49
TABLE II.15 - CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INVESTIGATION STAGE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	51
TABLE II.16 - CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CASE WHICH INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CLAIM IS INVESTIGATED.....	52
TABLE II.17 - FREQUENCY WITH WHICH SPECIFIC METHODS ARE USED TO ESTABLISH FRAUD CLAIMS.....	54
TABLE II.18 - CHARACTERISTICS OF A CASE WHICH ENTER INTO THE DECISION TO REFER THE CASE FOR PROSECUTION.....	56
TABLE II.19 - FUNCTIONAL LEVEL OF THE STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR ARRANGING FOR PAYMENT OF THE CLAIM.....	58
TABLE II.20 - FREQUENCY WITH WHICH ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS ARE USED TO PURSUE DELINQUENT CLAIMS.....	60
TABLE II.21 - CHARACTERISTICS OF A CASE WHICH ENTER INTO THE DECISION TO PURSUE THE CASE WITH ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS.....	62
TABLE II.22 - CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROCESS FOR CLAIMS SUSPENSION.....	63
TABLE II.23 - CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROCESS FOR CLAIMS TERMINATION.....	65
TABLE II.24 - REASONS GIVEN FOR THE BACKLOG OF OVERISSUANCES AND CLAIMS TO BE PROCESSED.....	68

# LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

TABLE II.25 - ROUGH PROFESSIONAL ESTIMATES OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.....	69
TABLE II.26 - ROUGH MEASURES OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS, FY 1985.....	71
TABLE III.1 - DETAILED CHARACTERISTICS OF A STATES' CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS INCLUDED IN THE DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES, BY STATE...	75
TABLE III.2 - SUMMARY OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS, BY STATE....	78
TABLE III.3 - FREQUENCIES OF STATES' RESPONSE VALUES FOR THE DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES.....	80
TABLE III.4 - MEAN RESPONSE VALUES FOR DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES, BY ALL STATES AND SELECTED STATE SUBGROUPS.....	82
TABLE III.5 - DISTRIBUTION OF STATES AND RESPONSE VALUES FOR DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES BY ROUGH MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS.....	86
TABLE IV.1 - ORGANIZATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS: PERCENT OF CASELOAD IN LOCAL AGENCIES WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS.....	91
TABLE IV.2 - AUTOMATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS: PERCENT OF CASELOAD IN LOCAL AGENCIES WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS.....	94
TABLE IV.3 - MANAGEMENT OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS: PERCENT OF CASELOAD IN LOCAL AGENCIES WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS.....	97
TABLE IV.4 - METHODS USED TO DETECT OVERISSUANCES: PERCENT OF CASELOAD IN LOCAL AGENCIES WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS.....	101

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overissuances occur when food stamps are provided to ineligible households or when eligible households receive food stamp allotments that are greater than the amount allowed under program regulations. When an agency determines that a household has received food stamps to which it is not entitled, the state is mandated by law and regulations to establish a claim against and to collect the overissuance from that household. Within the constraints of the law and regulations, states have considerable discretion in how they operate and administer the claims collection process. However, little systematic information exists on the policies and procedures adopted by states and local agencies, or on the effectiveness of agencies at collecting claims.

Accordingly, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has sponsored research to learn more about these aspects of the Food Stamp Program (FSP). Claims collection is one of six general topics covered in a study of FSP operations being conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., and its subcontractors, Abt Associates, Inc., and the Urban Institute.

The first phase of the study entailed interviews with state-level food stamp personnel in the 50 states, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Questions in the claims collection component of the interviews covered the organization and administration of the claims collection process; the extent to which the claims process is automated; the policies and procedures involved in identifying overissuances, establishing and collecting claims, and suspending and terminating delinquent claims; and some tentative measures of the effectiveness of the claims collection process. The data collected in the census of state agencies were used to prepare preliminary descriptive profiles of the states' claims collection processes.

The second phase of the study, a survey of a national sample of 187 local food stamp agencies (FSAs), focused on claims collection operations within local offices. Because responsibility for claims collection activities may be delegated completely or partially to local, district, or state agencies, or to combinations of these offices, the survey data were collected to enhance and complete the census-based descriptive profiles of food stamp operations in all the states. In addition, the

survey data were used to develop a nationally representative picture of claims collection processes.

This report describes the claims collection processes of the states and selected local FSAs within the states. Findings are summarized below for each major topic area.

Organi-  
zation and  
Adminis-  
tration

The majority of states show mixed levels of state, district, and local responsibility for operating the claims collection process; however, after a claim has been established, activities become increasingly centralized through state-level intervention in most states.

In addition, specialized staff are involved in the claims process at some level in all of the states, although the exact nature of the staff and the functions they perform are quite diverse. In some agencies, the specialized staff simply help the caseworker investigate and establish the claim, while in others the specialized staff are organized into special units and assume full responsibility for the entire claims collection process following the referral of the overissuance.

The claims collection process, unlike other operational areas of the Food Stamp Program, may involve a number of local, district, and state agencies. Consequently, a variety of managerial methods and techniques for monitoring the progress of individual cases may be necessary to administer the claims collection process effectively. Forty-eight of the states utilize routine summary reports to assess how well the claims collection process is working and/or to effect communication among the various units involved in the claims process. Within the majority of the states, at least some of the local offices also prepare routine summary reports. Nationally, routine reports are prepared in both state and local FSAs for 63 percent of the FSP household caseload. Routine status reports on individual overissuances or claims cases are a less frequently used managerial tool within the claims collection process, as are time limits to control the period required to investigate, establish, and collect on a claim. Most states have instituted some type of system for tracking overissuances and claims and systems for signalling workers when claims cases require further attention, although relatively few of the agencies incorporate information on the age of the overissuances or claims in their systems. Only about 15 percent of the national caseload are represented by local agencies that have a

system for aging claims. The ability to "age" overissuances and claims is a useful function because it helps ensure the timeliness of the actions required at each stage of the claims collection process.

#### Automation

The majority of the states have instituted automated claims collection processes that complement the functions performed by their automated food stamp certification systems; those systems are frequently made available to the local agencies within their respective states. However, the extent to which these state and local systems support the claims process varies considerably. The automated claims systems of most of the states include a history of the household's payments on the claim, while only about one-half of the systems overall maintain a history of the dates of all actions taken on overissuances and/or claims. Few of the state systems are capable of calculating the amount of the overissuance itself. However, the majority of these automated systems routinely calculate the recoupment amount and deduct that amount from the household's food stamp issuance. Approximately one-half of the state-level systems have the capacity to generate demand letters automatically at the appropriate time intervals. Proportionately fewer of the locally available automated claims systems can automatically generate demand letters. Only about one-fifth of the national caseload are covered by local FSAs with such a capability.

#### Policies and Procedures

In the first stage of the claims collection process--identifying the overissuance--states report using a wide array of detection methods. The following approaches were frequently perceived by the states as the most effective: computer matches of wages and unearned income, recertification reviews, Quality Control reviews, and conflicting information provided by the client. Because the detection of overissuances is generally a local office function, many local agencies tend to employ more of the detection methods than do their respective states. The methods which rank among the most effective nationally include computer matches of wages and unearned income, recertification reviews, and error-prone profiles.

Investigating the identified overissuances frequently entails using specialized staff, particularly to investigate cases of suspected fraud. In general, states appear to expend more resources on investigating and pursuing suspected fraud cases than nonfraud



cases. The following reasons were cited for emphasizing fraud claims over nonfraud claims: (1) the necessity of protecting the integrity of the program, (2) financial incentives established by FNS, and (3) the higher dollar amount involved in most fraud claims.

Of the four methods available for establishing fraud claims--prosecution, disqualification consent agreements (DCAs), administrative disqualification hearings (ADHs), and waivers of hearing--only prosecution is used in all states. Because responsibility for claims activities at the establishment phase shifts away from the local level, agencies report that prosecution tends to be a state- rather than local-level function. DCAs and waivers of hearing are not used in 9 and 10 states, respectively. The ADHs and waivers of hearing are the preferred methods for establishing fraud claims among most of the state and local offices.

The process of establishing the claim typically involves a shift in the type of staff responsible for claims activities. First, fraud claims that are referred for prosecution and are established through the courts often move to agencies outside the control of the FSA. Second, as we have stated, the claims collection process is increasingly centralized at the state level after a claim has been established. Finally, in many states, a shift is evident in the use of specialized staff to collect payments on the claim.

Collecting claims payments from households which are no longer participating in the FSP or which have been issued overpayments due to agency error is generally more difficult, since recoupment is not a possible means of collection.<sup>1/</sup> Thirty-seven state agencies, and the local offices of 4 additional states, currently use some type of alternative collection technique, most frequently wage garnishment, tax refund intercepts, small claims court, and property liens, to collect on claims against households that have failed to respond to other collection efforts. Although these alternative collection methods are seldom used by most agencies, several agencies reported that the threat of their use

---

<sup>1/</sup> Claims due to agency error can be collected through recoupment only if the client agrees to that type of repayment.

is often an effective method for generating claims payments.

The suspension and termination of claims are relatively low priority functions within the states, and, consequently, many agencies have large backlogs of both delinquent claims which are eligible for suspension and suspended claims which are eligible for termination. Staff shortages and the lack of resources were the reasons cited most frequently by state and local agencies for not maintaining an accurate accounting of the collectible claims that are outstanding.

Effective-  
ness

The quantitative assessment of the effectiveness of the claims collection process requires information on the flow of cases through the claims process. Since the necessary information is not maintained by the state or local agencies, professional estimates and administrative data from Form FNS-209 are used to construct a tentative profile of effectiveness. Because both the professional estimates and administrative data suffer from severe problems, measures of the effectiveness of the claims collection process are considered only rough indicators. Given the poor quality of the effectiveness data, it is not surprising that a close relationship does not appear to exist between any of the characteristics of the claims collection processes and the measures of the effectiveness of claims collection. However, the measures of effectiveness would appear to suggest that the claims collection process can be improved substantially.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report describes the results of two series of interviews on the claims collection processes used by Food Stamp Agencies. The interviews were administered as part of the first and second phases of the three-phase Food Stamp Program Operations Study (FSPOS), which is being undertaken by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., and its subcontractors, Abt Associates, Inc., and the Urban Institute, under contract to the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The first phase of the FSPOS, the "census," entailed administering telephone interviews to state agency staff in the 53 state-level Food Stamp Agencies (FSAs) (including Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia), focusing on the practices and procedures that comprise the states' food stamp claims collection operations.<sup>1/</sup> The census data were examined and used to develop descriptive profiles of the states' claims collection processes and to establish a typology of claims collection processes based on organizational and operational characteristics. Because responsibility for claims collection activities may be delegated completely or partially to local, district, or state agencies, or combinations of those offices, the census data did not always provide a complete picture of a particular state's claims operations. Consequently, in the second phase, a telephone survey was administered to a national sample of 187 local agencies to collect information on their claims collection operations.<sup>2/</sup>

---

<sup>1/</sup> In addition to covering the states' claims collection processes, the census of state agencies focused on 5 other areas: automated certification systems, computer matching, monthly reporting, quality control, and job-search activities. The results of the census interviews on claims collection and the five other areas are presented in separate census reports.

<sup>2/</sup> Because the census provided relatively complete descriptive profiles of automated certification systems, monthly reporting, quality control, and job search, local FSA follow-up data collection efforts were unnecessary. However, the survey of local offices did include interviews on computer matching operations in addition to claims collection operations. The results of the survey interviews on computer matching are presented in a companion survey report.

In the second phase, the two primary objectives of the FSPOS project were to gather data comparable to the census data from local FSAs in order to complete the descriptive profiles of the state systems and to confirm or modify the placements of the state systems within the typology established following the census. In addition, the survey data were used to develop a nationally representative overview of claims collection operations.

The third phase of the FSPOS project plan will consist of intensive assessments of selected sites, focusing on the costs and benefits of particularly promising examples of Food Stamp Program (FSP) operations identified in the first two phases of the study. Further project reports will be issued on Phase III.

Section A of this introduction outlines the goals of the census and survey interviews on the claims collection process. Section B briefly reviews the sources of the data, describing the state and local agency samples and the data collection methods. Section C discusses the scope of the reported results, and Section D describes the organization of the remainder of this report.

#### A. GOALS OF THE CENSUS AND SURVEY OF CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESSES

The primary purpose of the census interviews on claims collection in the FSP was to develop clear, consistent, and complete descriptive profiles of state systems currently in use, and to establish a typology which allows systems to be distinguished according to categories based on the methods that are used to organize and operate the claims collection functions. Because responsibility for claims collection activities may be completely or partially delegated to local agencies, the survey data were collected to complete the descriptive profiles of the claims systems of states and to confirm or modify the census-established typology.

Based on the census and survey data collection, the descriptive profiles of the claims process cover:

- o The techniques that are used to discover overissuances and to investigate, establish, and recover claims

- o The policies and procedures of the claims collection process which are defined at the state and local level
- o The claims collection information functions used by state and local FSAs, such as automated tracking systems and systems for monitoring claims
- o A profile of the current backlog of overissuances and claims

In addition, a preliminary analysis of the effectiveness of the claims collection process was undertaken on the basis of administrative data (Form FNS-209) collected by FNS.

The need for complete descriptive profiles was given the highest priority during the census design period, after a review of a broader set of questions on claims collection that are of interest to FNS. Additional questions of interest to FNS, identified at the outset of the FSPOS, included the following:

- o What are the costs of the different claims collection systems?
  - What are the costs of identifying overissuances, establishing claims, and making collections?
  - What is the relationship between the claims collection approach and the cost of claims collection activities?
  - How do the costs of the claims collection effort vary according to the characteristics of the households that have overissuances and claims?
- o How effective are the different claims collection systems?
  - How effective is each stage of the claims collection process (identification, establishment, and recovery) in dealing with the potential or actual claims cases from the preceding stage?
  - How effective are claims suspension and termination practices, and what conventions should states follow in suspending or terminating the pursuit of collections?

- How does the effectiveness of the claims collection process vary according to the characteristics of the households that have overissuances and claims?
- o Given the impact of different collection approaches on the costs and effectiveness of the claims collection process, what claims collection approaches are most cost-effective?
- o What approaches are used to "age" claims and prioritize claims collection activities?

Based on a review of the data commonly compiled and reported by state and local FSAs, and in view of the data collection constraints inherent in telephone interviewing, a conclusion was reached during the census design period that the census and survey data collection efforts would not be able to create a useful data base for a serious analysis of the costs, effectiveness, and cost-effectiveness of the claims collection process. Such detail will require a more extensive analysis of claims collection systems. Consequently, questions on costs and effectiveness were deferred for possible exploration in the intensive assessment stage of the FSPOS.

#### B. SAMPLE AND INTERVIEWING METHODS

Four aspects of the census and survey provide the necessary background for presenting the results: (1) the sample of state agencies covered in the census, (2) the sample of local agencies covered in the survey, (3) the data collection instruments and interviewing methods that were used in both the census and the survey, and (4) the use of materials received from state agencies.

#### State Agencies Included in the Census

The general purpose of the claims collection census was to describe the operational processes used in each state based on the interviews with state FSA staff. The claims collection interview was attempted for all state FSAs and the FSAs in the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, or 53 jurisdictions. The interview was administered successfully to all of the jurisdictions, except California and North Dakota. The California FSA was not able to respond meaningfully to the instrument because of the wide variation in the claims process across the local FSAs. In North Dakota, the pressures of current work and staff shortages made it impossible for FSA staff to participate in the study.

Local  
Agencies  
Included in  
the Survey

The census data collection effort indicated that the level of operational responsibility for different components of the claims collection process varies widely among the states. In some states, the claims process is primarily a state or district function following claims referral; in those states, the census

claims collection process did not vary significantly at the local level, 2 local FSAs were chosen for the sample; for states that did exhibit substantial variation at the local level, 5 local FSAs were generally selected.<sup>4/</sup> The selection of only 2 local agencies from the former set of states was nonetheless expected to provide the information necessary for confirming the profile of the claims collection process obtained from the census and to provide additional information on some operational procedures used within local offices, information that will be necessary for selecting local site candidates for the intensive assessments in FSPOS Phase III. Details of the survey sample design are included in Appendix C of this report.

While the sample of local offices is not intended to be representative of local FSAs within any particular state, the total sample is nationally representative of the claims collection process faced by the FSP caseload. Consequently, the survey data can be used to create a national profile of FSP claims collection activities.

The District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey sample because most of their claims collection activities are centralized in the "state"-level FSA; interviews with local FSAs were not expected to provide more information than that which had been gathered in the census.

The survey interview was attempted with the sample of 187 local agencies, and was administered successfully to 171. Sixteen local offices in 8 states were unable to respond, generally because of staff and/or resource constraints. Although such nonresponse was not a problem in most states, none of the selected sample

---

<sup>4/</sup>While Maine was considered a state which exhibits substantial variation at the local level, the relatively small size of its FSP caseload and the small number of its local FSAs made it necessary to select only 2 sample sites in that state. For states with a mix of state and local responsibility for various claims collection activities, 2 sites were selected in states that operate more centralized claims systems (or where the census data were believed to be relatively complete), and 5 sites were selected in states that operate less centralized systems (or where the census data were relatively incomplete).



sites in Connecticut and Idaho could participate in the study; thus, no local data are available for either state.

The lack of data on local agency claims collection activities in Connecticut does not hamper developing that state's descriptive profile, because the census data were relatively complete and indicated substantial state-level responsibility. However, in Idaho, census respondents reported a wide mix of state and local responsibility. The lack of survey data to confirm and supplement the census data in Idaho means that only an incomplete descriptive profile is available for that state.

Data  
Collection  
Instruments

The FSPOS project included two separate data collection efforts, which required separate approaches for developing the census and survey data collection instruments. Telephone interview census instruments were developed after an extensive review of the data already available from FNS files, earlier research, and state reports to FNS. The census instrument questions were written to elicit codable structured responses, either binary (yes/no) answers or prerecorded answer categories. Open-ended questions were rare, and answers to them were used primarily to interpret responses to other questions as necessary. Skip patterns were included in the census instrument so that only questions relevant to the particular agency were asked.<sup>5/</sup>

Following the preparation of the census instrument drafts and their review by FNS, pretests of the instruments were administered to three state agencies in all six of the operations areas covered by the FSPOS census.<sup>6/</sup> Based on these pretests, substantial changes were made to the instruments to improve their clarity and completeness.

---

<sup>5/</sup>The claims collection census instrument is attached as Appendix D, and the Type B survey instrument as Appendix E. The Type B instrument is representative of all 3 survey instruments, because it encompassed all of the questions that appeared in the other 2 survey instruments.

<sup>6/</sup>The help of agency staff in the pretest states (Connecticut, Tennessee, and Texas) was very valuable and is gratefully acknowledged.

The local FSA survey instruments were developed largely on the basis of the census data and data collection experiences. With the census data, states' claims collection systems were classified as one of three organizational types--predominantly state-operated, with little local variation (Type A); a combination of local-, district-, and/or state-level responsibilities (Type B); or primarily locally operated (Type C). Since the extent to which the census-based descriptive profiles were complete varied by organizational type, the interviews that were conducted with local FSAs in states of each type required separate survey instruments, each with its own specific focus.

In Type A states, the census data were sufficient to prepare descriptive profiles of their claims collection operations. The survey instrument for those states was written to gather limited data for confirming certain organizational and managerial aspects of their systems that were uncovered in the census. The Type A instrument was a shorter version of the census instrument, modified to include local references.

Because the census data from Type B states indicated varying combinations of local, district, and state responsibilities for claims collection activities, the survey instrument for those states included both modules that all local FSAs were required to answer and modules that local FSAs without sufficient census information had the option of answering in order to complete the descriptive profiles of the states. The required modules were the same general organizational and management modules that comprised the entire Type A instrument. The optional modules were comparable to the remaining modules in the census instrument, modified to include local references, and were administered to a local agency if the local agency was responsible for a stage of the claims collection process.

In Type C states, where claims collection activities are operated primarily at the local level, the required modules in the survey instrument included all of the required and optional modules in the Type A and Type B instruments.

#### Interviewing Methods

Interviewing methods in the census and survey data collection efforts were quite similar. Census interview respondents were nominated by state FSP directors or their delegates in preliminary telephone discussions with senior FSPOS research staff. In many instances,

multiple respondents were suggested, most often a senior staff member involved in developing policy and procedures and a staff member involved in preventing and/or detecting fraud and abuse. In some cases, the FSP director was one of the respondents. Copies of the census instrument and letters that explained the purpose of the FSPOS were mailed to the interview delegates in all 53 jurisdictions, in the expectation that advance notice and a review of the instrument would facilitate administering the actual interview. However, even with advance preparation and where multiple respondents were suggested, interviewers often encountered situations in which the respondents suggested other agency staff as the best sources of answers to specific questions; interviewers then contacted these other staff. Of the 51 census interviews completed, approximately 33 entailed contacting additional respondents. Claims collection census interviews generally lasted about two hours overall.

Preparation for the local survey interviews included several steps. The first step was to send a letter to state agency directors to advise them of the timing and purpose of the FSPOS survey and to request their assistance in naming the appropriate liaisons with the 187 selected local agencies. Executive interviewer staff followed up on the letters by telephoning the state agencies to obtain the names of the local agency directors or other designated respondents.<sup>7/</sup>

Letters and the appropriate survey instruments were then forwarded to the local agencies. After allowing time for the local offices to receive the interview package, the FSPOS executive interviewers called the designated officials for the names of the staffpersons nominated to respond to the instrument. The nominees included claims supervisors, casework specialists and program technicians, directors of income maintenance programs, and local agency administrators. As was true for the census interview, multiple respondents were often named for the claims collection survey interview, and similar additional contacts beyond the initial suggestions were often necessary. The length of the survey interviews

---

<sup>7/</sup>In a few cases, the state agency official suggested that certain selected agencies be released from the study sample and replaced with other local agencies with comparable caseload sizes.

varied--Type A interviews generally lasted about 40 minutes, Type B interviews about 60 minutes, and Type C interviews about 80 minutes.

Although the claims collection census and survey instruments consisted almost entirely of structured-response questions, the interviewing method entailed in-depth discussions of the questions and nondirective probes to clarify responses. This process was necessary because of the complexity and variety of state and local operations and the consequent difficulty in establishing consistent interpretations of terminologies among interviewers and between interviewers and respondents. The difficulty with consistent terminology was an even greater problem in the survey than in the census. For example, the names of units or the job titles of staff who appeared to be performing similar functions in different offices showed little uniformity. To help ensure consistency, the census/survey coordinator and the senior project researcher who was assigned to the claims collection topic reviewed every completed interview. The reviews uncovered apparent inconsistencies among interview responses, and identified answers which, based on other information provided, appeared to reflect interpretations of interview terminologies that departed from the intent of the interviews. As the interviews proceeded, these reviews also identified the necessity for clarifying the intent of specific questions and their interpretations further within the context of particular system characteristics.

Based on these reviews, three steps were taken. First, "question clarification" statements were prepared and distributed to interviewers to guide them in the further administration of particular interview questions. Second, interviewers called respondents back to clarify or confirm responses and to probe further to resolve what appeared from the interviewers' perspective to be inconsistencies. Call-backs were made for this purpose to almost every responding state FSA and the majority of the local FSAs. Finally, several additions were made to

the set of coded question responses defined in advance of the interviews.<sup>8/</sup>

Use of  
Materials  
from State  
Agencies

In addition to the telephone data collection activities described above, the census phase of the FSPOS entailed collecting background materials from state agencies. State agencies were asked to provide a variety of materials: application, recertification, and monthly reporting forms, computer input forms and worksheets, procedures and policy manual sections pertinent to each operations area, and any existing statistical or management reports that could supply data in response to some of the more complex census interview questions. Although the request for these materials prior to the census interviews was intended to solicit only existing data, forms, and reports, it is clear that many agencies devoted substantial efforts to assembling the materials.

The materials provided by the state agencies formed an important contextual background for an analysis of the census and survey interview questions. In some cases, the data available in these materials provided responses to specific interview questions, which saved time in the interviews. In other instances, where the complexity or subtlety of the procedures or systems of a state or local office could not be captured completely in the structured interview responses, the background materials were used to ensure that the interview responses were interpreted correctly.

#### C. SCOPE OF REPORTED RESULTS

The claims collection census and survey interviews were designed to provide consistent, systematic profiles of the state and local systems examined, and to present the collected data in a structured form that facilitated drawing comparisons among claims collection processes along commonly defined dimensions. The instrument design process emphasized developing carefully worded

---

<sup>8/</sup>Specifically, codes were added to identify specific units and/or staff involved in the claims collection process and to identify the characteristics of the cases which had an impact on how the case was handled in the claims process (e.g., Questions 5.13, 5.20, and 5.25 in the census instrument and Questions 5.10, 5.20, and 5.25 in the Type B survey instrument).

questions that could solicit structured, codable responses. Although this approach makes it possible to compare systems and summarize system features, it also imposes certain inevitable weaknesses on the capacity of the instrument to capture detail and subtle differences among systems. Using an interview format that consists of more open-ended questions, and reporting on the salient features of each system in descriptive text, would provide more detail and clarity on each approach. However, this interview method was rejected, because it would likely have complicated the process of compiling summary information and comparing systems.

The results presented in this report are based on the classification of claims collection process characteristics according to the distinctions formulated in the interview questions and response codes. Given the format of the interviews, many questions elicited responses that did not correspond directly to response codes. Interviewers took notes during the interview to capture the content of such responses. It was then the job of the interviewer (often in consultation with the researchers who were working on this topic) to interpret the response and record an answer.

This process necessitated that interviewers take three types of actions: (1) interpreting the intent of the question when the response raised questions about distinctions not explicitly included in the question wording or response codes, and not yet covered in interviewer training; (2) selecting an appropriate response code based on the clarified sense of the question; and, in a number of instances, (3) adding code values to the codes originally defined, to capture important distinctions. The net effect of this process was to conceal some differences among systems or peculiarities of particular systems for the sake of describing all of the systems in comparable terms.

The census and survey data collection efforts were relatively successful in meeting the two primary goals of the FSPOS project--to develop descriptive profiles of the states' claims collection operations, and to construct a nationally representative picture of the claims collection process. However, it is important to bear in mind that, because the survey sample within each state was small, the survey results do not constitute statistically representative estimates within the states. Consequently, the local data can only indicate

the extent of variation in the state and do not necessarily reflect all of the local variation.

The survey results are used in different ways for the 3 groups of states:

- o For the 19 states whose claims collection activities are largely state-operated, the census data provide relatively complete descriptive profiles; the survey data from the Type A data collection instrument are used to confirm these profiles.
- o For the 14 states in which a limited range of claims functions are performed at the local level, the survey data from the Type B instrument are used to fill in the gaps of our census-based knowledge of the states' systems.
- o For the 20 states in which claims collection is primarily a local function, the survey data from the Type C instrument are used to provide most of the states' descriptive profiles.

In states in which a great deal of variation exists across the local agencies in terms of how the claims collection process is organized and/or operated, state FSA census respondents were asked to provide information on the claims collection process as it applies to the majority of their caseload. Given the small survey sample within each state, census and survey data may appear inconsistent in some instances where a particular local office may differ from the characteristics reported in the census for the majority of the caseload.

In preparing the states' descriptive profiles, the survey data gathered from local offices on actual local office claims processes were compared with the available census data. Where census data indicated the presence of or responsibility for a particular function in the local agencies but the survey data did not, the census data were used as the basis for the descriptive profile as they were more representative of the entire state. In those states in which census data indicated the absence of a particular feature or responsibility in the majority of its local offices, but survey data indicated otherwise, the survey data were used to create more indepth profiles of the claims process within the states.

Because the nationally representative overview of the claims collection process is based on the local FSA survey data, the lack of local data for 16 sample sites also potentially influences the national numbers by introducing a small degree of nonresponse bias into the analysis. (The unavailability of data for the 16 local FSAs represents less than 1 percent of the caseload to be examined in developing the national overview.)

In addition to the information necessary for developing a descriptive profile of state claims collection systems and constructing a national picture of the claims collection process, the census and survey attempted to draw a very limited characterization of the effectiveness of the various processes of the claims system. An analysis of the effectiveness of the claims system requires information on the flow of cases through the claims process, since actions taken at each stage of the process are conditioned upon the actions taken at the previous stage of the process. In other words, the effectiveness with which the state or local FSA collects on claims is a function of the success with which the state establishes claims, which in turn is a function of the state's ability to detect overissuances. No state FSAs maintained the data necessary for examining these conditional measures of effectiveness, and local FSAs were even less likely to have such data available. Thus, the analysis of the effectiveness of the claims collection process will rely on some very rough professional estimates by the states and on existing administrative data from Form FNS-209. While not useful for developing the conditional measures of effectiveness, Form FNS-209 data do permit developing very rough proxies of effectiveness.

#### D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remainder of this report consists of three chapters. Chapter II provides a brief overview of the functions involved in the claims collection process and presents the descriptive data collected in the claims collection census and survey, with tables and accompanying text to summarize the census and survey results according to major topics. Chapter III describes the types of systems that can be distinguished from the census and survey results and classifies the states' claims collection processes according to this typology. In addition, it examines the relative effectiveness of the states' claims collection processes



based on state-level data. Chapter IV provides a nationally representative overview of the claims collection process, and outlines areas for possible further assessment under the FSPOS Phase III.

## II. DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Overissuance occurs when food stamps are provided to ineligible households or when eligible households receive benefits that are greater than the amount allowed under program regulations. The client and the FSA share responsibility for determining the household's food stamp eligibility and benefit level. The client is required to provide the information that enables the agency to determine the household's need. The agency is required to process that information in a correct and timely manner. When an agency determines that a household has received food stamps to which it was not entitled, the state is mandated by law and regulations to establish a claim against and to collect the overissuance from that household.

In practice, the operation and administration of the claims collection processes implemented by the state and local FSAs exhibit a great deal of diversity. This chapter provides a general overview of the functions involved in collecting claims and a detailed profile of the claims collection processes used by the state and local FSAs.<sup>1/</sup> The detailed profile consists of nine areas:

1. The organization of the claims collection process
2. The automated processes used to collect claims
3. The management of the claims collection process
4. The detection of overissuances
5. The investigation of overissuances
6. The establishment of claims

---

<sup>1/</sup>"State" is used here to refer to the 50 states for which data are available, and the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. "Local FSA" is used to refer to the 171 local offices for which data are available. Local agencies in Idaho and Connecticut did not respond to the survey, while local agencies in the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands were not included in the survey because their claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

7. The collection of payments on claims
8. The suspension and termination of claims
9. The effectiveness of the claims collection process

#### A. OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

In organizing this descriptive profile of the claims collection process, we have identified six steps or stages of the claims collection process:<sup>2/</sup>

1. Claims referral
2. Claims investigation
3. Claims establishment
4. Claims collection
5. Follow-up activities on delinquent claims
6. Claims suspension and termination

While the approaches used at each stage of the claims process vary among and within states, a general claims collection process prevails. Figure II.1 shows the general structure of the claims collection process.

The claims collection process begins with the discovery that a household has received food stamps for which it is not entitled. Following the discovery of the over-issuance, the FSA must, in most circumstances, take

---

<sup>2/</sup>These six stages do not necessarily correspond to the structure of the claims collection process in a particular state or local FSA. For example, in some state and local offices, the claims referral and investigation stages constitute a single process. However, in order to provide a consistent description of the systems, we use this six-stage definition of the claims process for all states and local FSAs.



action to set up a claim against the household.<sup>3/</sup> This stage of the claims process--the discovery of the overissuance and the formal steps taken to initiate the claims process--is labelled "claims referral."

Following the claims referral stage, the nature of the error that led to the overissuance must be determined (i.e., administrative error, inadvertent household error, or intentional program violation); the amount of the overissuance must be calculated; and any inquiry into the circumstances of the overissuance must be performed. This stage is referred to as "claims investigation." In this stage, a distinction is made between nonfraud cases (i.e., claims due to administrative errors or inadvertent household errors) and suspected fraud cases (i.e., claims believed to be due to intentional program violations); claims are generally investigated more thoroughly for cases of suspected fraud.

The third stage of the claims process--claims establishment--is different for cases of nonfraud error and cases of suspected fraud.

For nonfraud errors, establishing the claim entails deciding whether or not to initiate collection actions, and, if so, notifying the household by a letter of demand explaining the amount and circumstances of the claim. If the household chooses to appeal after being notified of the claim, a fair hearing is also required. The decision to initiate collection action or not depends on the size of the claim, whether it can be collected by reducing the household's food stamp allotment, and whether the household can be located. Collection actions will be initiated for all claims of \$35 or more. For claims of less than \$35, collection actions are initiated only if the overissuance is due to a household error and the household is currently participating in the Food Stamp Program (so that the claim can be collected by reducing the household's food stamp allotment). If the state or local office has

---

<sup>3/</sup>No claim is required if the overissuance occurred because (1) the FSA failed to ensure that the household signed the application form, completed a work registration form, or was certified in the correct project area; or (2) the household transacted an expired (but unaltered) Authorization to Participate (ATP) card.

documentation that the household cannot be located, the collection of the claim, regardless of its size, will not be initiated.

Establishing a claim for an overissuance from suspected fraud entails different procedures, as indicated in Figure II.1. The amount of the claim for an intentional program violation is calculated as the amount overissued from the time of the violation until its discovery, up to a maximum period of six years. Until fraud has been established, the claim for the amount of overissuance in the 12 months prior to the discovery of the error can be processed as an inadvertent household error. Fraud can be determined through an administrative disqualification hearing, a waiver of the hearing by the household member, the judicial system, or a disqualification consent agreement.

After fraud has been established, the guilty household member is disqualified from the program, and the state initiates collection actions against the individual's household for the entire amount of the claim.<sup>4/</sup> As with nonfraud claims, the household receives a demand letter specifying the nature of the claim and outlining the possible methods for repayment.

The fourth stage of the claims process involves the collection of payments on the claim. The household can pay the claim or make arrangements to pay by any one (or a combination) of three methods: lump sum, installments, or a reduction in the food stamp allotment. If the household fails to pay (or to continue to make payments on) the claim, the FSA is required to take one of the following actions:

- o For current program participants, the FSA must reduce the food stamp allotment when a household error is involved (whether intentional or unintentional).
- o When an administrative error is involved or the household is no longer participating, the FSA must continue to send demand letters until the household pays or agrees to pay, until the criteria for

---

<sup>4/</sup> In cases where fraud is established through judicial proceedings, the collection actions of the state or local FSA may be determined by those proceedings.

suspending the claim are satisfied, or until the FSA initiates other collection actions of its choice.

The collection stage of the claims process includes procedures for setting up the claim for repayment, the use of demand letters, and procedures for tracking claims payments and recoupment amounts.

The fifth stage of the claims process consists of the follow-up activities that are used to pursue payment on delinquent claims. This stage entails identifying delinquent claims and using alternative collection methods to collect on the claim, such as wage garnishment and tax refund intercepts.

The final stage of the claims process covers the suspension and termination of the claim. This stage entails identifying claims which are eligible for suspension and termination and initiating the processes by which those actions are taken. A claim can be suspended following the mailing of the required demand letter(s) if:

- o The FSA has documentation that the household cannot be located, or
- o the cost of further collection activities is likely to exceed the amount which can be recovered.

A claim can be terminated after it has been held in suspension for three years.

Despite the general uniformity of the claims process as stated in the regulations, the organization of the process varies significantly across and within states. In many state and local offices, a central claims processing unit handles part or all of the investigation, establishment, and collection procedures following the claims referral.<sup>5/</sup> In other states, particularly those whose programs are state-supervised and county-administered, all of the components of claims processing are handled within each local office.

---

<sup>5/</sup>In a number of state and local FSAs, the centralized claims office handles claims for several assistance programs (e.g., food stamps, AFDC, Medicaid, and General Assistance).

## B. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

As shown in Table II.1, the organization of the claims collection process across the states ranges from very centralized systems, in which all the activities following the referral of the overissuance are under state-level jurisdiction, to arrangements which involve only the local or county FSA. Not surprisingly, the states that operate state-supervised, county-administered programs tend to have the more decentralized claims collection processes. However, a substantial proportion of those states, like the majority of states in general, have mixed levels of responsibility for operating the claims collection process, with the later stages of the process (that is, collection, follow-up activities on delinquent claims, and suspension and termination of claims) becoming increasingly centralized.

In addition, the activities of the claims process are frequently centralized through specialized staff or units. As shown in Table II.2, specialized staff are used at some level in each of the states and, for those states whose claims collection process varies across counties, within a substantial proportion of counties within the states. These specialized staff consist of two basic types--claims/collections staff or units, and fraud/investigations staff or units.<sup>6/</sup> However, the exact nature of these staff and the functions which they perform are quite diverse. In some states, the specialized claims staff simply help the caseworker investigate and establish the claim (e.g., Illinois) or handle only the collection of payments and the follow-up activities on delinquent claims (e.g., New Mexico and Utah). In other states, the specialized claims staff takes full responsibility for the entire claims process

---

<sup>6/</sup>Note that the terminologies used here--"claims/collections unit" and "fraud/investigations unit"--are not always consistent with the claims collection arrangements within a state or local FSA. For consistency in describing the claims systems, any specialized unit which focuses on both nonfraud and fraud cases, at any stage of the claims collection process, the report refers to a claims/collections unit. Specialized units which focus primarily on investigating suspected fraud and/or establishing fraud claims are referred to as fraud/investigations units.



TABLE 11.1

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR  
OPERATING THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Characteristic	Number of States		Total
	State-Administered Program	State-Supervised/County-Administered Program	
Organization of Food Stamp Program	37	14	51
Level of Responsibility for the Claims Collection Process Following Claims Referral <sup>a</sup> :			
Local/county only	0	6	6
Local/county and district/region and/or state	32	8	40
District/region and/or state only	5	0	5
Level of Responsibility for the Claims Collection Process Following Claims Establishment <sup>b</sup> :			
Local/county only	1	7	8
Local/county and district/region and/or state	13	6	19
District/region and/or state only	23	1	24

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.1 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: Because the primary purpose of the local FSA survey was to complete the descriptive profiles of the states rather than replace the state FSA census data, this table is based on the census data only.

<sup>a</sup>Stages of the claims collection process following claims referral include investigation, establishment, collection, follow-up on delinquent claims, and suspension/termination.

<sup>b</sup>Stages of the claims collection process following claims establishment include follow-up activities on delinquent claims, collection, and suspension/termination.

TABLE 11.2  
USE OF SPECIALIZED STAFF IN THE  
CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Characteristic	Number of States		Total
	Claims/Collections Staff or Unit	Fraud/Investigation Staff or Unit	
Specialized Staff	43	41	51
Level of Operation			
Local/county	23	13	25
District/region	7	5	10
State	32	29	40

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.1 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: This table is based on the census data only. Some states have specialized staff at more than one level of operation, so the numbers do not always add to the number of states with special units.

following referral (e.g., Colorado and New Hampshire). Similarly, the specialized fraud/investigations staff may provide assistance to the caseworker in especially difficult cases of suspected fraud (e.g., Alabama, Hawaii, and Wisconsin) or may handle all of the investigation, establishment, and collection activities for fraud claims (e.g., Alaska and Florida). These specialized staff may consist of workers with specialized functions within the local office or may be a separate unit of specialized staff at the local, district, and/or state level. The exact functions performed by each state's specialized staff will be explored in later sections which discuss the six stages of the claims collection process.

An additional dimension along which the organization of the states' claims collection processes varies is the degree to which the process is integrated with the claims collection processes for other programs. High levels of integration would suggest a reduction in the administrative costs of the food stamp claims process and the more efficient detection of overissuances (given the information available through the other programs).<sup>7/</sup> As shown in Table II.3, only 2 of the 53 states do not integrate the food stamp claims collection process with the claims collection processes of other

---

<sup>7/</sup>High levels of integration may also create problems in terms of how recovered funds are allocated appropriately to the proper programs when a household has an outstanding claim in more than one program.

TABLE 11.3

SUMMARY OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE FOOD STAMP CLAIMS  
COLLECTION PROCESS WITH THE CLAIMS COLLECTION  
PROCESSES OF OTHER PROGRAMS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Integration			Number of States with State and Local Integration			Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Integration			Number of States with No Integration	
	General			General			General				
	AFDC	Medicaid	Assistance	AFDC	Medicaid	Assistance	AFDC	Medicaid	Assistance	Total	
Integrated Food Stamp Claims Collection Process	6	4	3	40	35	27	5(13)	3(5)	2(2)	2	
Stage of Claims Collection Process											
Referral	5	3	2	37	30	23	5(11)	3(5)	2(2)	--	
Investigations	6	4	3	40	34	27	5(11)	3(5)	2(2)	--	
Establishment	5	3	2	36	28	22	5(8)	3(4)	1(1)	--	
Collections	5	3	2	37	27	22	5(8)	1(2)	0(0)	--	
Follow-up for delinquent claims	4	3	2	35	26	22	3(6)	2(2)	1(1)	--	
Suspension/terminations	4	3	2	33	25	20	3(6)	2(2)	1(1)	--	

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.2 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.2.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 23.

programs.<sup>8/</sup> Of the 51 states which have some type of integration, 5 are integrated at the state level only, 5 are integrated at the local level only, and 41 are integrated at both the state and local FSA levels. In all cases where integration does exist, the food stamp claims collection process is integrated with the AFDC claims collection process. In addition, for the majority of cases, the food stamps claims process is also integrated with the claims processes of Medicaid and General Assistance. The degree of integration tends to be greatest at the earlier stages of the claims process, declining in the period following the investigation stage of the process. The pattern of integration across the stages of the claims collection process is quite similar for states that have state-only, state and local, or local-only integration. The movement toward a separate process for some or all of the later stages of food stamp claims collections can be attributed to the different regulations that govern collections procedures and subsequent activities for the programs (e.g., rules for repayment options and recoupment, and requirements for demand letters).

---

<sup>8/</sup>The tables in Chapter II summarize data from the detailed tables of Appendix A into 4 state groupings for comparison purposes: (1) data on states in which the characteristic being described is reported to be the sole responsibility of the state-level FSA; (2) data on states in which the characteristic being described is reported to be the shared responsibility of state- and local-level FSAs; (3) data for states in which the characteristic being described is reported to be the sole responsibility of local-level FSAs; and (4) data on states in which the characteristic is reported to be nonexistent at the state or local level. In group (3)--shared state and local responsibility--the number of states represented by the local FSAs with the described characteristic, the number of local FSAs within those states with the described characteristic, and the total number of local FSAs interviewed within those states, are presented in the tables. For example, under the third major column heading of Table II.3, the number of states in which the food stamp and AFDC claims collection process is integrated only at the local level is 5; 13 of the local FSAs interviewed within those 5 states have an integrated food stamp and AFDC claims collection process. As noted in the footnote to the table, a total of 23 local FSAs were interviewed in those states.

### C. AUTOMATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

The use of automated systems for calculating overissuance and recoupment amounts, monitoring the status of claims, and maintaining an account of claims payments is one factor that can contribute to an effective and efficient claims collection system.<sup>9/</sup> Although the majority of the states (51 of 53) have automated claims collection processes at the state and/or local level (with local FSAs frequently augmenting the state automated systems with additional automated processes), the functions performed by the state and local automated systems vary considerably between the two levels (see Table II.4).<sup>10/</sup> Most state-local and local-only systems include a history of the household's claim payments, although 7 states track recoupment payments but not other types of payments.

---

<sup>9/</sup>Identifying automated claims collection systems within the local FSAs that truly augment a state's automated claims system was frequently a difficult task. Since the local offices did not generally distinguish between state and local components of an automated systems, survey respondents frequently were not able to identify local-level functions. In those cases, information provided by the respondent on all the automated claims collection functions performed in the local office was recorded. Consequently, a function that is performed by a local automated claims process can be identified as such only if the local office reports that a function is automated despite the fact that the state office reports that there is no automation of any kind or that the particular function is not automated at the state level.

In addition, census data on automated certification systems (one of the other topic areas covered in the census) and on automated claims collection operations were compared with survey data on claims collection, and revealed variations in the reported levels and extent of automated systems in both state and local FSAs. These variations are likely to reflect differences among respondents to the claims collection and the automated certification system census and survey instruments in terms of their knowledge of the capabilities of the automated systems.

<sup>10/</sup>A new computer system installed by the Idaho FSA in November 1986 may include some automated claims collection components.

TABLE II.4

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY THE AUTOMATED  
CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Automation	Number of States with State and Local Automation	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Automation	Number of States with No Automation
Automated Claims Process	6	41	4(9)	2
Functions Performed by the Automated System				
Calculation of overissuance amount	1	7	1(1)	--
Calculation of recoupment amount	4	27	2(3)	--
Deduction of recoupment amount from issuance	5	32	4(7)	--
Generation of demand letters	3	19	0(0)	--
Maintenance of history of:				
Case actions	1	30	4(5)	--
All actions	1	23	3(4)	--
Most recent actions only	1	7	1(1)	--
Recoupment	4	38	4(7)	--
Other claims payments	3	33	3(5)	--
Claim suspensions	3	30	3(4)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.3 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.3.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 15.

For the 6 state-only automated systems, maintaining a history of the claims payments is a less frequently used function; 4 of those systems track recoupment payments.<sup>11/</sup>

Maintaining an automated history of the dates of actions taken on overissuances and claims is a less frequently used function, particularly for the state-local and state-level only automated systems. In contrast, all states that are automated only at the local level maintain some type of automated history of case actions. For those automated systems that do maintain histories of case actions, evaluations of the effectiveness and/or timeliness with which the claims collection process operates can be performed.

Much less frequent than automated histories of claim payments or case actions is the ability of the automated system to generate demand letters. Less than one-half of the state-only and state-local automated systems have the capacity to generate demand letters automatically at the appropriate time intervals. For the 4 local-only automated systems, none of the systems is capable of generating demand letters.

Most of the automated systems appear to be fairly well suited to the mechanical functions of calculating the amount of the recoupment and deducting that amount from the household's food stamp issuance. However, few of the systems have the capacity to calculate the amount of the overissuance itself. Only 9 of the 53 states have

---

<sup>11/</sup>The automated claims collection system in Kentucky maintains a case history only for claims payments through methods other than recoupment.



automated systems that are capable of calculating the overissuance amount.<sup>12/</sup>

In 4 of the 6 states in which census respondents reported that the claims process is manual, many of the local survey respondents reported that some level of claims automation is available. The use of automated systems in these local offices, but not in the state offices, is consistent with the decentralization of the claims process in those states.

#### D. MANAGEMENT OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

The claims collection process, while administered by the state FSAs, often involves a variety of local, district, and state agencies and specialized staff or units. The ability of the FSAs to manage the process effectively across these groups depends on a number of factors. This section discusses several managerial methods which may contribute to the effectiveness of the state's claims collection process. These managerial methods, which do not constitute a definitive list of the factors which may influence the effectiveness of claims collection, are as follows: the use of internal reports, the use and content of staff training, the availability of manuals on the policies and procedures of the claims process, the use of time limits to control the processing of overissuances and claims, and methods

---

<sup>12/</sup>As noted previously, census data collected on automated food stamp certification systems (ACSs) and automated claims collection processes vary in terms of some components of the states' automated systems. Questions in the census instruments did not ask respondents to differentiate between functions performed by a state's ACS and automated claims system; however, the data would suggest that the distinction was made in some cases. Census claims respondents in 10 states, for example, report that the systems do not automatically deduct the recoupment amount, while census ACS respondents report that the ACS in 5 of those states do have that capability.

used to monitor individual cases within the claims collection process.<sup>13/</sup>

Internal  
Reports

Forty-eight of the 53 states use routine summary reports (other than Form FNS-209) to assess how well the claims collection process is working and/or to effect a method for communicating among the various units involved in the process (see Table II.5). In 8 states, the summary reports are produced only at the state level, while in 5 states only the local agencies produce the reports. In the remaining 35 states, both state and local units help produce the summary reports.

The stages of the claims collection process covered by the reports vary considerably. The reports in only 13 states cover all six stages for fraud and/or nonfraud overissuances and claims, while in the remaining states virtually all cover the collection of claims payments in the summary reports. Less frequently covered are claims establishment, the processing of delinquent claims, and claims suspension and termination.

Routine reports on the status of individual overissuances or claims cases are a less frequently used managerial tool within the claims collection process. As reported in Table II.6, routine status reports are not used at all in 14 states. Of the remaining 39 states, 14 use routine status reports at the state level only, 18 produce both state and local status reports, and 7 produce only local-level status reports. These reports most frequently consider the status of established and delinquent claims; the status of claims referral is included in the reports in only 20 states.

In states which produce the summary reports and/or status reports at the state level only, the reports tend to be distributed more widely at the state and/or district level than at the local level, as shown in Table II.7. Similarly, in states where only the local

---

<sup>13/</sup>One managerial method that was not considered in this report, but which may influence the effectiveness of the claims process, is the direct supervision of claims collection personnel. For example, the Nevada FSA relies heavily on a system of supervisory case reviews and the accountability of eligibility claims workers for all actions on a case.

TABLE II.5

STAGES OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS  
COVERED BY ROUTINE SUMMARY REPORTS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Summary Reports	Number of States with State and Local Summary Reports	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Summary Reports	Number of States with No Summary Reports
Preparation of Routine Summary Reports	8	35	5(15)	5
Stage of Claims Collection Process Covered by the Reports				
Referral	5	19	5(8)	--
Investigation	5	18	5(7)	--
Establishment	8	27	5(10)	--
Collections	8	34	4(12)	--
Delinquent claims	5	23	5(7)	--
Suspension/termination	5	23	5(9)	--
All six stages	2	7	4(2)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.4 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.4.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 20.

TABLE II.6

STAGES OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS  
COVERED BY ROUTINE REPORTS ON THE  
STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL CASES

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Status Reports	Number of States with State and Local Status Reports	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Status Reports	Number of States with No Status Reports
Preparation of Routine Status Reports	14	18	7(10)	14
Stage of Claims Collection Process Covered by the Reports				
Referral	11	8	1(3)	--
Establishment	14	18	6(9)	--
Delinquent claims	10	15	5(7)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.4 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.4.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 29.

TABLE II.7

## GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF ROUTINE SUMMARY AND STATUS REPORTS

	Number of States with State-Only Summary Reports	Number of States with State and Local Summary Reports	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Summary Reports	Number of States with No Summary Reports
Level of Operation				5
Local/county	3	22	5(13)	--
District/region	2	6	1(1)	--
State	8	32	3(4)	--
All levels	8	35	5(15)	--

  

	Number of States with State-Only Status Reports	Number of States with State and Local Status Reports	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>b</sup> ) with Local-Only Status Reports	Number of States with No Status Reports
Level of Operation				14
Local/county	7	12	7(10)	--
District/region	4	3	0(0)	--
State	11	13	1(1)	--
All levels	14	18	7(10)	--

agencies produce the reports, the reports are distributed primarily within the local agency itself.

Not surprisingly, when both the state and local agencies help produce reports, the reports tend to be distributed across both state and local offices.

#### Staff Training

In 51 states, the state and/or local FSA provides staff training specifically on the claims collection process (see Table II.8). Of those states, 5 have local-level training only. Among the 5 states with only local-level training and the 2 states with neither state nor local training, the following were among the reasons given by state FSAs for not providing training: (1) eligibility determination--not collecting on claims--is the agency's first priority; (2) funding cuts have reduced the agency's ability to provide training; (3) the workers "learn by doing" in the area of claims collections; and (4) the claims workers tend to be experienced ex-caseworkers who require little training. Of the states with state and/or local training, almost all offer training for new hires and either schedule refresher training for existing staff or retrain existing staff as it becomes necessary (e.g., following a rule change).<sup>14/</sup>

For states with state-only or state-local training, the training tends to concentrate on two areas--improving the detection of overissuances and increasing the worker's understanding of the rules, regulations, and procedures of the claims collection process (including how to use the state's automated claims system effectively, if it has one). Less common is training which focuses on methods for preventing overissuances, investigating overissuances, and obtaining collections on claims. In contrast, when training is solely a local-level function, the training tends to cover all of the areas considered in Table II.8.

#### Written Manuals

Written manuals which provide detailed information on the policies and procedures of the claims process are available to staff in all but 4 states and nearly all local FSAs within all the states (see Appendix Table A.5). In addition, in those states that do not provide claims-specific manuals, the states' issuance manuals do

---

<sup>14/</sup>Alabama and Kansas limit the training in claims collection to existing staff, since new hires do not perform claims collection work.

TABLE II.8

EXTENT AND EMPHASIS OF STAFF TRAINING  
IN THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Training	Number of States with State and Local Training	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Training	Number of States with No Training
Provision of Training	6	40	5(16)	2
Extent of Training Provided:				
New hires	6	38	5(13)	--
Refresher training	5	24	5(11)	--
Retraining	6	40	5(15)	--
Areas of Emphasis in Training:				
Prevention of overissuances	1	3	5(12)	--
Detection of overissuances	4	19	4(9)	--
Investigation methods	0	9	4(7)	--
Collection methods	2	8	4(14)	--
Regulations and procedures	4	17	4(11)	--
Vary across state	0	5	0(0)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.5 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.5.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 20.

provide a general overview of the claims collection process.

#### Time Limits

Using time limits to control the length of time necessary for workers to investigate, establish, and collect on a claim has been suggested in an audit of the FSP claims collection process (OIG, 1985) as one method for reducing the large backlog of potential claims. As noted in Table II.9, fewer than one-half of the state FSAs currently have any established time limits which control the processing of claims. Of the 30 states without state-level time limits, however, the majority of local FSAs in 14 of those states use time limits in various stages of the claims collection process, and particularly in the early stages of referral, investigation, and establishment.

Of the states without some type of state and/or local time limits, several census and survey respondents reported that time limits were unnecessary because there were no backlogs of potential claims within their agency. In other states, more interest was expressed in emphasizing that the work on the claim be completed rather than in setting up rigid time requirements. The inability of most of the state and local FSAs with established time limits to provide information on the percentage of cases that are processed within those time limits suggests that, for most agencies, the time limits are not closely monitored and, consequently, may not have much impact on the timeliness with which the claim is processed.

#### Monitoring Individual Cases

The methods used to monitor the progress of individual cases through the claims process include a system for tracking the status of an overissuance or claim, a system for signalling staff that a particular case requires further attention, and a system for sorting or reporting case actions based on the chronological age of the claims.

Tracking Systems. All 53 states provide some type of system for tracking overissuances and/or claims through the claims process (see Table II.10). These systems are used to check on the status of a case at certification or recertification, to check the status of cases which are pending (e.g., cases being held by a special investigation unit or by the District Attorney's office), and to prepare management reports on the activities of the claims collection process. The extent to which these tracking systems monitor claims at each



TABLE II.9

ESTABLISHED TIME LIMITS FOR PROCESSING  
CLAIMS BY THE STAGE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Time Limits	Number of States with State and Local Time Limits	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Time Limits	Number of States with No Time Limits
Established Time Limits	2	21	14(31)	16
Stages of Claims Collection Process with Established Time Limits				
Referral	2	12	8(13)	--
Investigations	1	15	12(19)	--
Establishment	1	19	10(15)	--
Collections	1	12	6(7)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.5 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.5.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 59.

TABLE II.10

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRACKING SYSTEMS USED TO MONITOR  
INDIVIDUAL CASES IN THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Tracking Systems			Number of States with State and Local Tracking Systems			Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Tracking Systems			Number of States with No Tracking Systems
	Manual Tracking System	Automated Tracking System	Total	Manual Tracking System	Automated Tracking System	Total	Manual Tracking System	Automated Tracking System	Total	Total
Tracking System	2	4	6	5	40	45	0(1)	2(3)	2(4)	0
Stage of Claims Collection Process Monitored by Tracking System										
Computer match hit	1	3	4	5	19	24	0(1)	2(3)	2(4)	--
Other apparent overissuances	1	2	3	4	21	25	0(1)	2(3)	2(4)	--
Referrals	2	1	3	4	27	31	0(1)	2(3)	2(3)	--
Investigations	2	1	3	4	27	31	0(1)	2(3)	2(3)	--
Established claims	2	4	6	4	39	44	0(1)	2(3)	2(4)	--
Claims collections	2	4	6	3	40	43	0(1)	2(3)	2(4)	--
Suspended claims	2	2	4	3	37	40	0(1)	2(3)	2(4)	--
Disqualified individuals	2	2	5	5	29	34	0(1)	2(3)	2(4)	--
Tracking System Monitors Cases through 6 or More of the above Stages	1	4	5	5	26	31	0(1)	1(3)	2(4)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.6 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.6.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 5.

stage of the process varies somewhat across the systems. With few exceptions, the tracking systems monitor established claims and claims payments. Somewhat fewer systems track disqualified individuals and/or the status of claims referrals and investigations. Finally, only about one-half of the systems track the status of computer match hits and/or other apparent overissuances.

In all but 2 states, the tracking systems include state-level involvement, with the majority of the systems incorporating a mixture of state and local responsibilities. Rather surprisingly, a high correlation does not seem to exist between the automation of the tracking systems and the extent to which cases at all stages of the claims process are monitored. Within the 45 states with state-local tracking systems, 40 have automated tracking systems, and 5 have systems that are manual. All 5 of the manual tracking systems cover 6 or more of the 8 situations summarized in Table II.10. In contrast, only 26 of the 40 automated systems monitor as many situations.

Flagging System. A second method for monitoring individual cases in the claims process is the use of "flags" to signal a worker when a claim case may require further attention. These flags can take the form of a notation in the household's file, a "clip" or color code attached to the file folder, a masterlisting (automated or manual) of the relevant cases, or a notation that appears on the computer screen as part of the state's automated certification system. Table II.11 summarizes the characteristics of the systems for identifying or "flagging" cases which need special attention. Of the 53 states, 51 have some type of system of flags, of which most (35) involve both state and local agencies. In 4 states, the flags are used only at the state level, while in 12 states case flags are an entirely local-level function.

The majority of the flagging systems identify both households with claims referrals that have yet to be processed (i.e., either dismissed or established as a claim) and households with active claims. Somewhat fewer systems flag households with either delinquent or suspended claims. A substantial number of states (29) have flagging systems that are either manual or only partially automated (i.e., some of the state's flags are manual). In most of the flagging systems, the flag

TABLE II.11

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEMS USED TO SIGNAL  
STAFF THAT A CASE NEEDS FURTHER ATTENTION

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only System of Flags	Number of States with State and Local System of Flags	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only System of Flags	Number of States with No System of Flags
System of Flags	4	35	12(38)	2
Types of Claims That Are Flagged				
Referral	3	25	12(31)	--
Active claim	3	29	12(33)	--
Delinquent claim	0	23	9(23)	--
Suspended claim	1	19	9(18)	--
Cases with disqualified individuals	0	0	12(31)	--
Vary across state	0	1	0(0)	--
Extent to Which System of Flags is Automated				
Manual	2	13	8(17)	--
Partially automated	0	6	0(0)	--
Fully automated	2	14	9(21)	--
Information not available	0	1	0(0)	--
One of More Flags Permanently Attached to Case Record	2	29	12(33)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.7 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.7.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 44.

remains attached to the case record until the claim is paid, corrective action is taken, or the claim is terminated. Thus, for these systems, the flag will remain in place on the case file should a household leave the program, and is intended to signal the eligibility worker to the existence of an outstanding claim should the household reapply.

Aging System. The final case-monitoring method considered here consists of processes for sorting and reporting on overissuances and claims by their ages (i.e., methods for "aging" overissuances and claims). The ability to age overissuances and claims is important for several reasons. First, it facilitates evaluating the timeliness with which the required actions of each stage of the claims process are completed. Second, it is useful as a method for determining when some type of "prompting" may be necessary for cases pending at the various stages of the process (e.g., cases held by the District Attorney for possible prosecution). Finally, to the extent that time requirements are built into the various stages of the claims process (e.g., a claim must be held in suspension for 3 years prior to termination), a system for aging claims facilitates executing those stages efficiently.

Established processes for aging overissuances and/or claims are relatively uncommon at the state level, as shown in Table II.12. Less than one-half of the states have an aging process at either the state-only or state-local level. Of the remaining states, only 12 have systems for aging at the local level, leaving 20 states with no state or local system for aging. In those states which do age overissuances and/or claims, the majority of aging systems in which states are involved focus on the ages of delinquent claims and suspended claims. The aging of claims investigations, claims referrals, and apparent overissuances (e.g., computer match hits) are much less common. States in which aging is a completely local process focus more frequently on claims referrals and investigations; the states focus less on aging overissuances, delinquent claims, or suspended claims. Thus, the local-only systems are more likely to focus on the early stages of the claims collection process than are the state-only or state-local systems.

The systems for aging overissuances and claims are frequently automated, with systems in 21 of the 33 states at least partially automated. However, local-

TABLE 11.12

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SYSTEMS USED TO SORT  
CLAIMS BY THEIR CHRONOLOGICAL AGE

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only System for Aging	Number of States with State and Local System for Aging	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only System for Aging	Number of States with No System for Aging
System for Aging	10	11	12(17)	20
Types of Claims That Are Aged				
Apparent overissuances	2	3	3(5)	--
Referrals	4	6	9(12)	--
Investigations	4	4	5(8)	--
Delinquent claims	10	8	5(6)	--
Suspended claims	8	10	5(6)	--
Extent to Which System of Aging is Automated				
Manual	2	3	8(11)	--
Partially automated	2	3	0(0)	--
Fully automated	6	5	5(6)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.7 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.7.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 45.

only aging systems are disproportionately manual relative to state-only or state-local systems. Eight of the 12 local-only systems are completely manual.

#### E. DETECTION OF OVERISSUANCES

The first step of the claims collection process entails discovering the overissuance and taking the formal actions necessary for initiating the claims process. Of the 13 detection methods listed in Table II.13 (excluding the "other" category), 9 are used in 40 or more of the 51 states. Those 9 methods, in order of their frequency of use, are as follows: Quality Control (QC) reviews, conflicting information provided by the recipient, recertification reviews, "hotlines" and other informal complaints, computer matching of earned income, information from other agencies, duplicate participation checks, special investigation units, and internal audits. Computer matches of both unearned income and resources, error-prone profiles, and supervisory reviews to identify likely cases with overissuances are used less frequently.

The states' rankings of the effectiveness of the various methods at identifying overissuances vary considerably for most of the 13 detection methods. However, computer wage matching is among the 3 highest-ranked methods in 35 states, while the recertification review is among the 3 highest-ranked methods in 31 states. Of the remaining methods, only QC reviews, computer matches of unearned income, and conflicting information from the recipient are viewed as among the most effective methods by one-quarter of the states.

Given that the detection of overissuances is generally a local office function, local agencies are more likely than state agencies to report using all available methods to detect overissuances. While states report using an average of 9 detection methods, local office respondents report that the local agencies employ nearly 11 (see Appendix Table A.8).

Confirming most of the states' rankings, the methods cited most frequently by local FSAs as among the 3 most effective are computer matches of wages, recertification reviews, and computer matches of unearned income. QC reviews are cited far less frequently by local FSAs than by state FSAs as among the 3 most effective detection methods.

TABLE II.13

FREQUENCY OF USE AND RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE  
METHODS USED TO DETECT OVERISSUANCES

Detection Method	Number of States		Number of Local FSAs	
	Using the Detection Method	Ranking the Detection Method Among the Three Most Effective <sup>a</sup>	Using the Detection Method	Ranking the Detection Method Among the Three Most Effective
Computer Matching				
Wages	47	36	160	126
Unearned income	38	16	156	82
Resources	12	2	48	6
Duplicate Participants Check	45	3	147	12
Error-Prone Profile	19	2	68	2
Hotline/Informal Complaint	48	8	166	32
Internal Audit	41	4	110	12
QC Review	51	19	170	27
Recertification Review	50	31	169	100
Special Investigation Unit	41	9	117	17
Information from Other Agencies	47	5	161	9
Information from Recipient	50	14	167	37
Supervisory Review <sup>b</sup>	4	1	156	22
Other <sup>c</sup>	4	2	12	7

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.8 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local agencies.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of states in this category is 51; California and North Dakota are not included because state-level data were not available when the census was conducted.

<sup>b</sup>"Supervisory Review" was not included as an alternative detection method in the census instrument, but was listed as a census response often enough that it was included among the possible detection methods listed in the survey instrument.

<sup>c</sup>Includes computer matches with credit bureau files, special case reviews, day-to-day activities of the caseworker, and manual bank record matches.



Local agencies tend to report using duplicate participation checks slightly more often than do states. In fact, in the 8 states which do not report that such checks are made, 21 of the 25 local offices do use duplicate participation checks (see Appendix Table A.8). Comments from respondents indicate that the local agencies are often matching caseload files across adjacent counties within the same state.

#### F. INVESTIGATION OF OVERISSUANCES

The second stage of the claims collection process--claims investigations--entails calculating the overissuance amount, determining the nature of the error, and undertaking any investigations into the circumstances of the error. Table II.14 focuses on the organization and structure of the investigation stage, while Table II.15 describes the characteristics of the investigation processes of states.

As shown in Table II.14, specialized staff are used to investigate suspected fraud cases in 45 of the 53 states. In contrast, only 23 states use specialized staff to investigate nonfraud claims. For both fraud and nonfraud investigations, the specialized staff almost always include both state and local responsibility.

This pattern of using specialized staff more frequently to investigate suspected fraud than nonfraud cases reflects both the absence of investigations into nonfraud claims in several states and the general effort in most states to provide more thorough investigations into cases in which fraud is suspected. The more intensive investigation of suspected fraud claims is also evidenced by the greater number of states that include searches for additional errors and/or program violations in cases of suspected fraud and by the greater relative emphasis on fraud cases in those states whose treatment of fraud and nonfraud cases differ.

The reasons cited for emphasizing the investigation and establishment of fraud claims over nonfraud claims include: (1) the necessity of protecting the integrity of the program by both eliminating current fraud and preventing future fraudulent acts; (2) the enhanced funding and financial incentives established by FNS to encourage the pursuit of fraud; and (3) the higher dollar amount involved in most fraud claims. Only four

TABLE II.14

ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE INVESTIGATION  
STAGE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Investigation	Number of States with State and Local Investigation	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Investigation
Specialized Staff Involved in Claim Investigations			
Suspected Fraud	2	30	13(34)
Nonfraud	2	15	6(26)
Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations			
Suspected Fraud	2	28	14(43)
Nonfraud	2	24	11(38)
Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts			
Fraud	1	14	4(13)
Nonfraud	0	2	2(5)
No difference	1	20	9(27)

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.9 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.9.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 46.

states emphasize nonfraud claims over fraud claims. The greater ease with which nonfraud claims can be investigated and established and the greater potential for recovering them are reported as the major factors for that emphasis.

Further evidence of the more intensive investigation of fraud claims is shown in Table II.15. In general, the states are more likely to use all of the investigation methods, particularly client interviews and third-party contacts, and to investigate suspected fraud claims, but not to use all methods to investigate all cases of nonfraud.

The greater effort involved in investigating suspected fraud claims has created a greater need for establishing priorities to determine which cases of suspected fraud should be investigated most actively.<sup>15/</sup> Systems for prioritizing suspected fraud claims have been established in 33 states, with all but 8 of those states utilizing priorities that have been established, at least in part, by the state FSA. Systems for prioritizing nonfraud cases are much less common. Only 19 states use a system to prioritize nonfraud claims. In 12 of those states, systems are a mixture of state and local FSA responsibility.

The systems for prioritizing suspected fraud claims, at all levels of investigative responsibility, are most frequently based on the dollar amount of the overissuance, the quality of the available evidence, and whether or not the claim involves a repeat offender or a flagrant violation of the program rules (see Table II.16). To a lesser extent, the age of the error and whether or not the household is currently participating in the program, are used to determine which cases should be followed up most aggressively. Similarly, for systems which prioritize nonfraud claims, the dollar amount of the overissuance, the age of the claim, and

---

<sup>15/</sup>A policy of "first in, first out," or processing claims in chronological order, is not considered a method for prioritizing cases.

TABLE 11.15

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INVESTIGATION STAGE OF  
THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Investigation		Number of States with State and Local Investigation		Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud	Nonfraud	Suspected Fraud	Nonfraud	Suspected Fraud	Nonfraud
<b>Methods Always Used to Investigate the Claim</b>						
Case file review	2	2	35	37	14(39)	13(41)
In-office/telephone interview	0	1	11	7	4(3)	2(1)
Home visit	0	0	3	0	1(0)	0(0)
Third-party contacts	0	0	19	6	5(16)	2(2)
Other <sup>b</sup>	1	1	1	1	2(4)	0(0)
<b>Established System for Prioritizing Cases for Investigation</b>						
	1	1	24	12	8(22)	6(19)

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.10 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local agencies.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data in Appendix Table A.10 for that state.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 46.

<sup>b</sup>Includes forensic investigations and record checks in the case records of another system.

TABLE II.16

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CASE WHICH INCREASE THE  
LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CLAIM IS INVESTIGATED

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Investigation		Number of States with State and Local Investigation		Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud	Nonfraud	Suspected Fraud	Nonfraud	Suspected Fraud	Nonfraud
System for Prioritizing Cases	1	1	24	12	8(22)	6(19)
Characteristic of Case That Increases Likelihood of Investigation						
Age/health/employment status of client	0	0	4	2	1(4)	0(2)
Public Assistance household	1	0	4	1	3(3)	2(2)
Household error	0	0	0	4	0(0)	2(4)
Age of error or claim	1	1	10	6	6(13)	4(12)
Active case	0	0	8	7	5(17)	6(14)
Dollar amount	1	0	23	10	8(18)	6(12)
Quality of evidence	1	0	22	0	8(15)	0(0)
Repeat offender/flagrant violation	1	0	21	0	8(18)	0(0)
Other <sup>b</sup>	0	0	0	1	1(9)	1(2)

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.10 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local agencies.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data in Appendix Table A.10 for that state.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 46.

<sup>b</sup>Includes errors due to unreported income and the projected cost of the follow-up on the case.

whether or not the household is currently participating in the FSP are the most important factors.<sup>16/</sup>

#### G. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CLAIM

The claims investigation process leads to a determination about whether a claim will be pursued as a case of suspected fraud or nonfraud error. Claims establishment entails initiating collection actions on an overissuance and notifying the household of the claim. These activities differ for cases of suspected fraud and nonfraud.

Of the four methods available for establishing suspected fraud claims--prosecution, disqualification consent agreements (DCAs), administrative disqualification hearings (ADHs), and waivers of the hearing--only prosecution is used by all 53 states (see Table II.17). Because functional responsibility for claims activities at the establishment stage shifts somewhat to the state level, it is not surprising that prosecution is used only by two-thirds of the local FSAs interviewed. In fact, within the 33 states in which responsibility for claims establishment is shared by state and local FSAs, a large proportion of the local agencies report that prosecution is not used at the local level (see Appendix Table A.11).<sup>17/</sup> Within the 5 states where claims are established at the local level, the local FSAs in all the states use prosecution.

TABLE II.17  
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH SPECIFIC METHODS  
ARE USED TO ESTABLISH FRAUD CLAIMS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Establishment		Number of States with State and Local Establishment		Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Establishment	
	Total	Number of States Using More Than One Method Which Rank the Establishment Method As the Method Used	Total	Number of States Using More Than One Method Which Rank the Establishment Method As the Method Used	Total	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) Using More Than One Method Which Rank the Establishment Method As the Method Used
		Most Frequently		Most Frequently		Most Frequently
Use of Establishment Method	15	15 <sup>b</sup>	33	31 <sup>c</sup>	5(3)	5(7)
Establishment Method						
Prosecution	15	2	33	9	5(3)	2(3)
Disqualification Consent Agreement	13	2 <sup>d</sup>	27	7	4(0)	2(0)
Administrative						
Disqualification Hearing	15	7	29	10	5(3)	2(1)
Waiver of Hearing	15	4 <sup>d</sup>	25	10	3(0)	1(0)

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.11 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local agencies.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.11.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 3; local data were not available for the remaining states.

<sup>b</sup>Delaware used more than one method but did not rank them; it was included in this number.

<sup>c</sup>Pennsylvania used more than one method but did not rank them; it was included in this number.

<sup>d</sup>The Disqualification Consent Agreement and Waiver of Hearing are a single process in West Virginia.

one establishment method rank prosecution as the most frequently used method. The ADHs and the waivers of hearing are reported to be the most common methods used to establish fraud claims in both state and local FSAs, regardless of the level of responsibility for establishment.

In choosing the appropriate method for establishing fraud claims, a number of states report that the least expensive methods (waivers of hearing and DCAs) are attempted first, with prosecution and ADH reserved for the more difficult or severe cases. In determining which cases will be pursued through prosecution, all of the states except New York screen the cases for the dollar amount of the overissuance. New York is unusual in that all cases are referred for prosecution. As shown in Table II.18, other factors which are frequently used to determine the cases that should be referred for prosecution include whether or not the individual has a history of food stamp fraud and whether or not the fraudulent act represents a flagrant violation of program rules.

Requiring higher-level staff to review the decision to establish fraud and nonfraud claims might be expected to improve the effectiveness of the establishment stage of the claims process by providing a quality control function. The majority of the states (38) do allow such staff to review fraud cases, nonfraud cases, or both (as shown in Appendix Table A.11). However, in several states, census respondents commented that the review process reduces the effectiveness of establishing claims because it creates a bottleneck that greatly reduces the speed with which cases can be processed.

#### H. COLLECTION OF PAYMENTS ON THE CLAIM

The staff involved in the claims collection process following the claims establishment stage represent a shift from the staff involved in claims investigations in three ways. First, fraud claims that are referred for prosecution and established through the courts often move to state- and local-level agencies outside the control of the FSA (see Appendix Tables A.11 and A.12). Consequently, contacts with clients (including any payments on the claim) are often funnelled through and monitored by the legal system (e.g., the probation office). The FSAs may have little control over the success with which claims payments are collected.



TABLE II.18

CHARACTERISTICS OF A CASE WHICH ENTER INTO THE  
DECISION TO REFER THE CASE FOR PROSECUTION

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Establishment	Number of States with State and Local Establishment	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Establishment
Dollar Amount	15	33	5(3)
Repeat Offender	10	26	5(3)
Flagrant Violation	10	26	5(2)
Strength of Evidence	0	3	1(3)
Age/Health of Client	0	2	0(0)
Other <sup>b</sup>	2	4	1(1)

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.11 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local agencies.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data in Appendix Table A.11 for that state.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 30; local FSA data were not available for the remaining states.

<sup>b</sup>Includes fraud in multiple programs; prosecutor's interest, time, and/or available funds for pursuing food stamp fraud; and systems in which all suspected fraud cases are referred for prosecution.

A second shift in the claims process following claim establishment is the increased use of centralized, state-level staff. As noted in Table II.1, the claims collection process in many states becomes more centralized as the case progresses through the six stages of the process. Finally, a shift occurs toward using more specialized staff at the later stages of the claims process. For example, in 6 of the 29 states in which the nonfraud claims are investigated by non-specialized staff (see Appendix Table A.9), specialized claims units are involved in notifying the household of the claim (see Appendix Table A.11) and/or arranging for the payment of the claim (see Appendix Table A.12).

As shown in Table II.19, the stage of the claims process which entails collecting payments on the claim is dispersed across various local-, district-, and state-level organizations. As noted earlier, the claims process becomes increasingly concentrated in specialized units and state-level agencies as the claims establishment and the later stages of the process are reached. Thirty-three states use specialized claims/collections units and 16 states use fraud/investigations units to arrange for the payment of claims. Over one-half of both types of units operate at the state level. In contrast, of the 30 states in which the local agency is involved in arranging for the payment of the claim, 27 report the general involvement of all staff.

States use varying schedules for mailing demand letters in attempting to obtain claims payments from the clients (see Appendix Table A.12). The majority of the state and local FSAs have instituted policies to mail demand letters every 30 days; the number of demand letters to be mailed ranges from a minimum of 1 to a specified maximum of 16.<sup>18/</sup> Other methods which are frequently used to notify households of a delinquent claim include

---

<sup>18/</sup> Six states have not established a standard number of demand letters to be mailed for fraud claims, claims due to household error, and claims due to agency error. One additional state has not established a standard minimum number for claims due to agency error.

TABLE 11.19

FUNCTIONAL LEVEL OF THE STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR  
ARRANGING FOR PAYMENT OF THE CLAIM

	Number of States				Total
	Agency	Claims/ Collections Unit	Fraud/ Investigations Unit	Legal Authority	
Level of Operation					
Local/county	27	10	4	13	30
District/region	0	4	3	4	6
State	2	21	9	14	28
All levels	27	33	16	31	51

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.12 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states.

NOTE: In some states, staff responsible for arranging for claims payments work at more than one level of operation, so the numbers do not always add to the total number of states.

late payment letters and periodic bills sent to the household, as well as telephone calls.<sup>19/</sup>

Collecting claims payments from households which are no longer participating in the program and from households whose claims are due to agency errors poses a significant problem, since such overpayments generally cannot be collected by recouping benefits.<sup>20/</sup> Under the Omnibus Reconciliation Acts of 1981 and 1982, Congress provided states with the authority to use any alternative collection method available under state law; further, the Food Security Act of 1985 required that states use all cost-effective collection methods for food stamp overpayments. As shown in Table II.20, 41 states use some type of alternative collection technique if collection through recoupment is not possible. However, 5 of those states use alternative collection methods only for fraud claims.<sup>21/</sup> The most common alternative collection methods are tax refund intercepts, wage garnishment, small claims court, and property liens. Within the 21 states in which alternative collection methods used by the states are used only at the state level, wage garnishment is used most often, followed by property liens and tax refund intercepts. Where both state and local agencies use alternative collection methods (16 states), pursuing a case through small claims court is the most commonly used method, followed by tax refund intercepts, wage garnishment, and property liens. In the 4 states in which only local agencies use alternative collection methods, wage garnishment, property liens, small claims courts, and civil actions are each used.

In terms of the frequency with which alternative collection techniques are applied, several FSAs report that such methods are viewed as an extreme solution and

---

<sup>19/</sup>Appendix Table A.12 contains the detailed state- and local-level information on demand letters and other methods used to notify households of the delinquent claim.

<sup>20/</sup>Claims due to agency error can be collected through recoupment only if the client agrees to that type of repayment.

<sup>21/</sup>The census and survey respondents were not asked about the methods that are available to them under state law, only about which methods they use.

TABLE 11.20

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION  
METHODS ARE USED TO PURSUE DELINQUENT CLAIMS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Use of Collection Methods		Number of States with State and Local Use of Collection Methods		Number of States (Local FSAs) with Local-Only Use of Collection Methods		Number of States with No Use of Alternative Collection Methods
	Total	Number of States Using More Than One Method Which Rank the Alternative Collection Method as the Method Used Most Frequently	Total	Number of States Using More Than One Method Which Rank The Alterna- tive Collection Method as the Method Used Most Frequently	Total	Number of States (Local FSAs) Using More Than One Method Which Rank the Alternative Collection Method as the Method Used Most Frequently	
Alternative Collection Methods	21 <sup>c</sup>	14	16 <sup>d</sup>	8	4	2(2)	12
Tax refund intercept	10	5	6	2	1	0(0)	--
Wage garnishment	13	3	3	1	2	0(0)	--
Property liens	11	1	3	1	2	0(0)	--
Small claims court	7	2	8	2	2	2(2)	--
Private collection agency	5	1	2	0	0	0(0)	--
Credit bureau	4	0	1	1	0	0(0)	--
Civil actions	4	2	2	0	2	0(0)	--
Other <sup>b</sup>	5	0	2	1	1	0(0)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.13 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.13.

<sup>a</sup>The base number for local FSAs in this category is 17.

<sup>b</sup>Includes all revenue intercept; requirement that the client work at a state agency to pay off the claim; state collection agency; and garnishment of circuit breakers (property tax relief for the elderly), college grants, and bank accounts.

<sup>c</sup>Four states in this category use the alternative collection methods to pursue delinquent fraud claims only.

<sup>d</sup>One state in this category uses the alternative collection methods to pursue delinquent fraud claims only.

are used only rarely. Other respondents report that, while other collection techniques are applied infrequently, the threat of their imposition is often quite effective at generating payments on delinquent claims. Overall, tax refund intercepts, small claims court, and wage garnishment were the 3 most frequently used methods by states when an alternative collection method was applied.

In 16 of the 40 states that use alternative collection methods, there are no established policies for determining which delinquent cases should be pursued with them (see Table II.21). Of the remaining states which do have established policies, 3 states pursue all delinquent cases, and 19 states screen cases for, among other characteristics, whether or not the claim is a fraud claim, whether or not the household is a current program participant, the length of time that the claim has been delinquent, and the dollar amount outstanding on the claim. The screening of cases (when it occurs) and the initiation of the alternative collection actions are performed almost exclusively by specialized units; only 3 states rely solely on staff workers (see Appendix Table A.13). Because the majority of the states operate the alternative collection activities in state and/or district offices, the use of alternative collection methods appears to be largely a centralized process.

#### I. CLAIMS SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION

According to federal regulations, a claim for which collection actions have been initiated and the required number of demand letters have been sent can be suspended (that is, placed in an inactive status) when:

- o The household cannot be located, or
- o the cost of further collection action is likely to exceed the amount that can be recovered.

A claim can be terminated after it has been held in suspension for 3 years and has been determined to be uncollectible. Appendix Tables A.14 and A.15 summarize the characteristics of state and local agency processes for suspending and terminating claims, respectively.

As indicated in Table II.22 (and in more detail in Appendix Table A.14), claims are suspended in nearly all states, and only at the state level in almost one-half

TABLE II.21

CHARACTERISTICS OF A CASE WHICH ENTER INTO THE DECISION  
TO PURSUE THE CASE WITH ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Use of Alternative Collection Methods	Number of States with State and Local Use of Alternative Collection Methods	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Use of Alternative Collection Methods	Number of States with No Use of Alternative Collection Methods
Alternative Collection Methods	21 <sup>c</sup>	16 <sup>d</sup>	4(7)	12
Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likelihood of Pursuit				
Dollar amount	11	3	1(1)	--
Inactive case	8	2	2(2)	--
Long-term delinquency	9	2	1(1)	--
Age of error or claim	1	2	0(0)	--
Public Assistance household	1	1	1(1)	--
Fraud claim	10	4	2(2)	--
Other <sup>b</sup>	5	2	1(1)	--
No Established Policy	6	8	2(2)	--
All Cases Pursued	0	3	0(0)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.13 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.13.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 17.

<sup>b</sup>Includes errors due to unreported income, current household employment or resources, and nonadjudicated fraud cases.

<sup>c</sup>Four states in this category use alternative collection methods to pursue delinquent fraud claims only.

<sup>d</sup>One state in this category uses alternative collection methods to pursue delinquent fraud claims only.

TABLE II.22

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROCESS FOR CLAIMS SUSPENSION

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Suspension of Claims	Number of States with State and Local Suspension of Claims	Number of States (Local FSA <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Suspension of Claims	Number of States with No Suspension of Claims
Suspension of Claims	23	25	1(3)	4
Existence of Claims Review Process to Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension				
Yes	17	18	1(2)	--
No	6	6	1(1)	--
Do not Know	0	1	0(0)	
Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher Level Staff				
Yes	6	14	0(0)	--
No	17	11	1(3)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.14 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.14.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 3.



of those states. Four states do not suspend claims at all, one state does not suspend fraud claims, and one state suspends claims only very rarely. In 3 of these 6 states (the District of Columbia, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin), claims are never or seldom suspended because of a policy which requires that claims be pursued continually. In Georgia, regulations forbid 3-year suspensions; however, there is a period of 5 years (for nonfraud cases) to 10 years (for fraud cases) during which established claims remain active prior to termination. In the remaining 2 states (Hawaii and the Virgin Islands), procedures for suspending claims are now being implemented.

In the states which do suspend claims, the majority have instituted some type of system for reviewing delinquent claims to determine whether or not they should be suspended. Most states report that this review process is manual and is very time-consuming. Thus, because of the shortage of staff, the review often does not occur in a timely manner and is not viewed as an effective method for maintaining an accurate account of the outstanding collectible claims. Only about one-half of the states report that the claims suspension decision is reviewed by higher-level staff. As one might expect, the majority of the states in which higher-level staff review these decisions are the states in which claims suspension activities are shared by state and local agencies.

Although claims can be terminated after being held in suspension for 3 years, 19 states carry suspended claims on the books for longer periods of time (see Table II.23). The time periods and reasons for carrying the suspended claims vary, although 4 states have legal requirements which prevent forgiveness of debts against the state and must thus carry the suspended claims indefinitely. Other frequently cited reasons for carrying suspended claims beyond the required 3 years include both requirements that efforts to collect on the claim be continued and the shortage of staff and/or resources for the relatively low-priority functions of claims suspension and termination. As was the case with suspensions, about one-half of the states overall report that claims termination decisions are reviewed by higher-level staff.

TABLE II.23

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROCESS FOR CLAIMS TERMINATION

Characteristic	Number of States with State-Only Termination of Claims	Number of States with State and Local Termination of Claims	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Local-Only Termination of Claims	Number of States with No Termination of Claims
Termination of Claims	22	26	1(3)	4
Suspended Claims Carried on Books Longer Than Required Three Years				
Yes	7	12	0(0)	--
No	15	14	1(3)	--
Claims Termination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher Level Staff				
Yes	7	13	0(0)	--
No	15	13	1(3)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.15 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the 22 states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.15.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 3.

## J. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Assessing the effectiveness of the claims collection process (and the various stages of the process) in each state and local agency requires data on the flow of cases through each stage of that process. In particular, it is important to determine:

- o The proportion of food stamp cases with overissuances (including overissuances for which claims are not required)
- o The proportion of overissuances that are identified for further claims action
- o The proportion of identified overissuances that lead to claims referrals
- o The proportion of claims referrals that lead to established claims
- o The proportion of established claims for which collections are obtained
- o The proportion of established claims that become delinquent
- o The proportion of claims that are eligible for suspension that are in fact suspended
- o The proportion of claims that are eligible for termination that are in fact terminated

It would also be useful to break the proportions down into those overissuances and claims that are associated with agency errors, household errors, and fraud (or suspected fraud), and to obtain such information over a period of time. Observations over time would indicate the stability of the relationships.

Unfortunately, as noted earlier, the state and local FSAs do not maintain the information that is necessary for examining the effectiveness of the claims collection

process.<sup>22/</sup> Thus, in obtaining a rough picture of the effectiveness of various claims collection systems, it is necessary to rely on professional estimates of effectiveness and the limited data available from Form FNS-209 reports.

Professional  
Estimates

The first issue in examining effectiveness is the existence of a backlog of overissuances and claims to be processed at various stages of the claims process. As noted in Table II.24, only 3 state agencies report that they are able to handle overissuances and claims in a timely manner, and that no backlogs exist. Two other states report that they have no backlogs of nonfraud overissuances or claims, but that backlogs of fraud claims have developed because of the longer time requirements of fraud investigations and the low priority placed by the courts on prosecuting fraud. Other states cite the long delays in investigating and establishing fraud claims as a major cause of their backlogs of fraud and suspected fraud cases. However, the reasons given most frequently for the existence of backlogs of overissuance and claims are the shortage of staff and/or resources devoted to claims collection activities and the relatively low priority of claims collections within the scope of FSA functions.

In the 4 states in which the local offices report backlogs but the state FSA does not, the reasons given for the backlogs include the shortage of staff and/or resources, the slowness of the claims process, and the lack of data processing capabilities.

The professional estimates of the percentages of cases handled successfully at each stage of the claims process, reported in Table II.25, are based solely on the state respondent's knowledge of his or her state's system. In no state was the respondent able to base his or her estimates on hard data. Consequently, these data should be viewed as rough professional judgments about the effectiveness of the systems.<sup>23/</sup>

---

<sup>22/</sup> However, several states reported that it would be possible to draw at least part of the necessary information from their automated systems.

<sup>23/</sup> Note that no professional estimates are available on the effectiveness of the beginning stages of the claims process (i.e., the detection of overissuances).

TABLE II.24

REASONS GIVEN FOR THE BACKLOG OF OVERISSUANCES  
AND CLAIMS TO BE PROCESSED

Characteristic	Number of States with Backlogs at State Level Only	Number of States with Backlogs at State and Local Levels	Number of States (Local FSAs <sup>a</sup> ) with Backlogs at Local Level Only	Number of States With No Backlogs
Existing Backlog	4	42	4(10)	3
Reason for Backlog				
Shortage of staff/resources	0	32	4(7)	--
Claims are low priority	0	17	1(1)	--
Process is slow for fraud cases	3	6	2(4)	--
Lack of data processing capabilities	0	4	2(3)	--
Limitations on recoupment/weak regulations	0	4	0(0)	--
Other	0		1(1)	--
No Reason Given	1	3	0(0)	--

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.16 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states and 171 local FSAs.

NOTE: In order to include in this table the states for which there are missing census or survey data (due to refusals or questions not asked of locals in states without local variation), Appendix Table A.1 was used as a basis for the initial placement of a particular state according to the above categories; final placement depended on the available data for that state in Appendix Table A.16.

<sup>a</sup>The base number of local FSAs in this category is 13.

TABLE 11.25

ROUGH PROFESSIONAL ESTIMATES OF THE EFFECTIVENESS  
OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Effectiveness Measure	Range of Values	Median Value	Number of States Providing an Estimate
Percentage of:			
Identified Overissuances That Result in Claim Referrals	33-100	95	21
Claim Referrals That Result in Established Claims	34-100	98	31
Claim Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Result in Established Fraud Claims	8-99	70	35
Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	15-100	65	34
Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent	15-90	50	33

**SOURCE:** Appendix Table A.16 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states.

**NOTE:** Because local FSA survey data were judged to be of poor quality for this series of questions, this table is based on state FSA census data only.

Although respondents in a substantial number of states and local offices were not able to provide estimates of the effectiveness of systems, the information that was provided suggests that the claims referral and claims establishment stages of the process are believed to be fairly effective, and that the establishment of nonfraud claims is more successful than the establishment of fraud claims. The collection of payments on the established claims appears to be much less effective; only one state reported some collections from every case that was established. The state estimates of the percentage of established claims that eventually become delinquent ranged from a low of 15 to a high of 90 percent. Twenty-four of the 33 states which provided information estimated that 50 percent or more of their established claims eventually become delinquent (see Appendix Table A.16).

Because the professional estimates of local agencies were often reported to be "wild guesses," the percentages were more wide-ranging than the state estimates and were judged to be insufficient for this analysis.

Existing  
Data

The existing data for examining the effectiveness of state claims collection processes include QC error rates (to estimate the level of overissuances) and information from Form FNS-209. While these data can be used to construct rough measures of the effectiveness of the state's claims collection system (as reported in Table II.26), several problems are associated with these measures. First, according to a 1985 OIG report, the timely and accurate reporting by state agencies to FNS on claim activities via Form FNS-209 is problematic. Thus, the available claims data may not be of particularly high quality. Second, measuring the effectiveness of the claims process requires information on the flow of cases through the process. Because Form FNS-209 provides information on the current status of the cases

TABLE 11.26

ROUGH MEASURES OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE  
CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS, FY 1985

Effectiveness Measure	Range of Values	Median Value
Value of Claims Established for Each \$100 of Food Stamps Issued in Error	\$4.67 - \$73.07	\$14.64
Value of Claims Collected for Each \$100 of Claims Established	\$7.08 - \$68.75	\$37.97
Value of Claims Collected for Each \$100 of Food Stamps Issued in Error	\$1.24 - \$24.32	\$5.36

SOURCE: Appendix Table A.17 contains the detailed information for each of the 51 states (and also information for California and North Dakota).



based on Form FNS-209 data will approximate the desired measures of effectiveness.

Based on the most recent QC error rate data available (FY 1984) to construct an estimate of the total issuances in error (that is, overissuances to eligible households and issuances to ineligible ones) in FY 1985 for each state and/or on the state's Form FNS-209 data on claims collection activities in FY 1985, three rough measures of the effectiveness of the state's claims collections process were obtained (see Table II.26). The dollar value of claims established in FY 1985 for each \$100 of food stamps issued in error in FY 1985 ranged from \$4.67 for Louisiana to \$73.07 for Hawaii. It would appear that states at the higher end of the range effectively identify and pursue overissuances through claims establishment, while states at the lower end of the range do not identify existing overissuances and/or do not effectively establish claims once the overissuance has been discovered. Furthermore, with a median value of \$14.64 of established claims for each \$100 of food stamps issued in error, it appears that the claims collection process from the detection through the claims establishment stages is not particularly effective.

The states would appear to be somewhat more successful at the collection stage of the claims process; the median value of claims collections in FY 1985 for each \$100 of claims established in FY 1985 was about \$38. However, interpreting this variable is rather difficult since (1) not all claims would be expected to be paid off during the year in which they were established, and (2) the measure compares FY 1985 collections on all claims, regardless of when they were established, with all claims established in FY 1985.

The final entry in Table II.26 is a rough measure of the effectiveness of the overall claims collection process as it relates total collections (on all claims) in FY 1985 to total overissuances in FY 1985. With a median value of \$5.36 of collections in FY 1985 for each \$100 in overissuances in that period, it is clear that there is a great deal of room for improvement in the claims collection processes.

### III. IDENTIFICATION OF DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES

Gaining an understanding of the different approaches adopted by the state and local FSAs to collect on claims and attempting to relate the various approaches to measures of the effectiveness of systems require that the array of system characteristics presented in the previous chapter be reduced to a smaller number of important distinctions. This section defines the descriptive typologies which will be used to classify the claims collection processes, characterizes the state systems on the basis of those criteria, and examines the relative effectiveness of the states' claims collection processes based on the descriptive typology.

Because the local FSAs that were selected for the survey were not representative samples within the states, the descriptive typologies were developed primarily from the census data. However, to the extent that the survey data supplement the census data, the survey data were used to refine the classification of states according to the descriptive typologies. This is especially important in California and North Dakota, where no census data were available.

#### A. DEFINING THE DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES

Grouping the detailed characteristics of the state claims collection processes to obtain summary descriptions of the state systems is of course subjective; results depend on which system features or capabilities are selected for the descriptive typology, and what detailed characteristics are included in each summary measure. The definitions of the descriptive typologies used in this study are based on the observed variation in the detailed characteristics of the state systems generated by the census and on the subjective assessment of the characteristics that are most likely to be associated with the effectiveness and efficiency of the claims process.<sup>1/</sup> These descriptive typologies are not based on all the characteristics presented in the previous chapters; however, they are intended to

---

<sup>1/</sup>Since the census data collection effort focused largely on those factors that are believed to be associated with the effectiveness and efficiency of the claims collection process, these descriptive typologies also focus on those factors.

reflect the major variations in the claims collection processes that were observed in the two stages of the FSPOS data collection. As shown in Table III.1, summary measures are developed to characterize the organization and operation of the claims collection process.

The descriptive typologies of Table III.1 cover six areas:

1. The organization of the claims collection process within the state
2. The use of specialized staff to operate the claims collection process
3. The extent to which the claims collection process is automated
4. The methods used to administer the claims collection process
5. The methods used to establish claims
6. The alternative methods used to collect claims payments

The measures for each of the descriptive typologies are based on either a simple yes/no distinction (e.g., specialized staff are/are not involved in establishing and collecting claims) or a numeric value for the total "value" of the component variables in that descriptive typology (e.g., the percentage of the five stages of the claims process for which operational responsibility rests at the district or state level). It is important to note that a "yes" or a higher score for a particular descriptive typology does not necessarily indicate a "better" system--it simply indicates the degree to which the claims system possesses a particular characteristic that is hypothesized to be associated with the effectiveness of the claims collection process.

TABLE III.1

DETAILED CHARACTERISTICS OF A STATE'S CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS INCLUDED IN  
THE DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES

Descriptive Typology	Detailed Characteristics Included in the Descriptive Typology	Measure	Source
ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS	Level of responsibility for the operation of the claims collection process for fraud and nonfraud claims is at the district or state level for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o claims investigations</li> <li>o claims establishment</li> <li>o claims collections</li> <li>o follow-up on delinquent claims</li> <li>o claims suspension/termination</li> </ul>	Percentage of the five stages of the claims collection process for fraud and nonfraud claims that are handled at the district or state level	Appendix Table A.1
OPERATION OF THE PROCESS	Specialized staff are involved in the operation of the claims collection process for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o claims establishment</li> <li>o claims collections</li> </ul>	A binary (yes/no) variable indicating the use of specialized staff in the establishment and collection stages of the claims collection process	Appendix Tables A.11 and A.12
AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS	Claims collection process is automated for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o calculation of amount of overissuance</li> <li>o calculation of amount of recoupment</li> <li>o deduction of recoupment amount from issuance</li> <li>o generation of demand letters</li> </ul>	Percentage of the four routine claim functions that are automated	Appendix Table A.3
AUTOMATED HISTORY	Automated history is maintained for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o case actions</li> <li>o claims payments through recoupment</li> <li>o claims payments through other methods</li> </ul>	Percentage of the three types of claims histories that are maintained by the automated system	Appendix Table A.3
MANAGERIAL METHODS	Methods used to manage the claims collection process include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o routine summary reports</li> <li>o routine reports on the status of individual cases</li> <li>o staff training</li> <li>o manuals on claims collections</li> <li>o established time limits</li> </ul>	Percentage of the five managerial methods that are used in the claims collection process	Appendix Tables A.4 and A.5
MONITORING METHODS	Methods used to monitor individual cases within the claims collection process include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o established tracking system</li> <li>o system of flags</li> <li>o system for aging claims</li> </ul>	Percentage of the three monitoring methods that are used in the claims collection process	Appendix Tables A.6 and A.7

TABLE III.1 (continued)

Descriptive Typology	Detailed Characteristics Included in the Descriptive Typology	Measure	Source
ESTABLISHMENT METHODS	Methods used to establish fraud claims include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o prosecution</li> <li>o disqualification consent agreements</li> <li>o administrative disqualification hearings</li> <li>o waivers of hearings</li> </ul>	Percentage of the four establishment methods that are used to establish fraud claims	Appendix Table A.11
ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS	Alternative collection methods (e.g., tax refund intercept, wage garnishment) used to pursue delinquent claims	A binary (yes/no) variable indicating the use of at least one alternative collection method	Appendix Table A.13

## B. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Table III.2 characterizes each state's claims collection process based on the descriptive typologies.<sup>2/</sup> As indicated in the table, the states' claims collection processes vary widely across each of the descriptive typologies. With the exception of measures that capture managerial and establishment methods, each descriptive typology includes states which do not possess that characteristic and states which show a full value for that measure. In terms of the typologies that describe managerial and establishment methods, all states use at least one of the methods included in each of the measures. Further evidence of the variation in the states' claims processes is indicated in Table III.3, which presents the full range of response values for each of the descriptive typologies.

While each of the descriptive typologies can be used to classify the state claims collection processes independently, it is worth considering whether relationships exist among the descriptive typologies which may facilitate grouping the claims collection processes into a more concise classification scheme.

Table III.4 examines the relationships among the descriptive typologies. The column entries in Table III.4 reflect the mean response values for each of the descriptive typologies for all states and for selected subgroups of states. The subgroups are defined on the basis of several of the descriptive typologies (e.g., states with highly centralized claims collection processes). For each subgroup, the mean value for each descriptive typology is compared with the mean value for those states that are not included in that subgroup to determine whether significant differences exist among the responses. (Note that the mean values for the excluded states are not reported in the table.) Significant differences in the mean response values for a particular descriptive typology (noted by an asterisk in the table) indicate a high correlation between that

---

<sup>2/</sup> To the extent that the state data collected in the census are less than complete, the survey data are used to supplement the census data in order to prepare more complete portraits of the state systems. Appendix B.1 presents an expanded version of Table III.2 by including summary characteristics for the 53 states and 171 local FSAs.

TABLE III.2

## SUMMARY OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS, BY STATE

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGERIAL METHODS: Percentage of Managerial Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collection Methods Used
Alabama	0	No	25	100	100	67	100	No
Alaska	80	Yes	75	100	60	67	100	Yes
Arizona	100	Yes	50	100	60	67	100	Yes
Arkansas	80	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Colorado	0	Yes	50	0	60	100	75	Yes
Connecticut	100	Yes	75	67	80	67	100	Yes
Delaware	100	Yes	50	33	60	67	100	Yes
District of Columbia	100	Yes	50	100	60	67	100	Yes
Florida	100	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Georgia	40	Yes	100	100	80	100	100	Yes
Guam	100	Yes	0	0	80	67	100	No
Hawaii	60	No	100	67	80	67	100	No
Idaho	70	Yes	0	0	60	67	75	Yes
Illinois	100	Yes	0	100	80	33	100	Yes
Indiana	20	No	0	33	60	67	50	Yes
Iowa	100	Yes	75	100	80	33	50	Yes
Kansas	80	No	50	100	80	67	100	Yes
Kentucky	100	Yes	25	33	100	67	100	Yes
Louisiana	100	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Maine	20	No	50	67	40	67	100	No
Maryland	50	No	0	33	60	67	100	Yes
Massachusetts	100	Yes	75	67	60	100	100	Yes
Michigan	50	No	75	100	80	33	100	Yes
Minnesota	20	Yes	25	100	80	67	25	Yes
Mississippi	80	Yes	25	33	60	67	100	No

TABLE III.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION	OPERATION		AUTOMATED				
	OF THE	OF THE		HISTORY:				
	PROCESS:	Specialized	AUTOMATED	Percentage				ALTERNATIVE
	Percentage	Staff	FUNCTIONS:	of Case	MANAGERIAL	MONITORING	ESTABLISHMENT	COLLECTION
	of Claims	Involved	Percentage	Action	METHODS:	METHODS:	METHODS:	METHODS:
	Process	in Claims	of Routine	and Claims	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage of	Alternative
	Centralized	Establishment	Claims	Payment	of Managerial	of Monitoring	Establishment	Collection
		and Collections	Automated	Automated	Methods Used	Methods Used	Methods Used	Methods Used
Missouri	80	Yes	25	100	100	67	100	Yes
Montana	70	No	25	67	60	67	75	Yes
Nebraska	50	No	25	67	60	67	100	No
Nevada	0	Yes	75	100	80	67	100	Yes
New Hampshire	100	Yes	0	33	60	67	75	Yes
New Jersey	0	Yes	0	0	80	67	100	Yes
New Mexico	80	Yes	100	100	80	33	100	No
New York	0	Yes	50	100	60	67	100	Yes
North Carolina	20	No	75	100	60	67	100	Yes
Ohio	0	Yes	0	0	60	100	100	Yes
Oklahoma	100	Yes	50	67	60	67	75	No
Oregon	100	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Pennsylvania	100	Yes	25	100	60	67	50	Yes
Rhode Island	90	Yes	50	100	60	100	100	No
South Carolina	20	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
South Dakota	60	Yes	50	100	100	100	100	Yes
Tennessee	60	Yes	0	0	60	0	100	No
Texas	90	Yes	75	100	100	100	75	Yes
Utah	80	Yes	50	67	60	67	100	Yes
Vermont	30	Yes	75	100	100	67	100	No
Virginia	50	Yes	0	100	80	67	50	No
Virgin Islands	100	Yes	100	0	40	67	100	No
Washington	70	No	75	100	80	67	100	Yes
West Virginia	100	Yes	50	33	60	67	100	Yes
Wisconsin	0	No	100	0	20	67	25	No
Wyoming	50	Yes	25	100	100	67	75	Yes



TABLE III.3  
FREQUENCIES OF STATES' RESPONSE VALUES  
FOR THE DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES

Descriptive Typology	Response Value	Frequency (Percent)
ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS:	0	13.7
Percentage of Claims	10-20	9.8
Process Centralized	30-40	3.9
	50	9.8
	60-70	11.8
	80-90	17.7
	100	<u>33.3</u>
		100.0
OPERATION OF THE PROCESS:	Yes	76.5
Specialized Staff Involved in	No	<u>23.5</u>
Establishment and Collections		100.0
AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage	0	19.6
of Routine Claims Functions	25	17.7
Automated	50	23.5
	75	29.4
	100	<u>9.8</u>
		100.0
AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage	0	15.7
of Case Action and Claims Payment	33	13.7
Histories Automated	67	15.7
	100	<u>54.9</u>
		100.0
MANAGERIAL METHODS: Percentage	0	0.0
of Managerial Methods Used	20	2.0
	40	3.9
	60	43.1
	80	27.5
	100	<u>23.5</u>
		100.0
MONITORING METHODS: Percentage	0	2.0
of Monitoring Methods Used	33	7.8
	67	66.7
	100	<u>23.5</u>
		100.0

TABLE III.3 (continued)

Descriptive Typology	Response Value	Frequency (Percent)
ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	0	0.0
	25	3.9
	50	7.8
	75	13.7
	100	<u>74.5</u>
		100.0
ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collection Methods Used	Yes	72.6
	No	<u>27.5</u>
		100.0

TABLE III.4

MEAN RESPONSE VALUES FOR DESCRIPTIVE TYPOLOGIES, BY ALL STATES AND SELECTED STATE SUBGROUPS

Descriptive Typology	All States	States with Highly Centralized Claims Processes	States Using Specialized Staff	States with Routine Functions and Case Histories Automated	States Using All Four Fraud Establishment Methods	States Using at Least One Alternative Collection Method
ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS:						
Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	63.7	100.0*	71.3*	68.4	65.3	65.7
OPERATION OF THE PROCESS:						
Specialized Staff Involved in Establishment and Collections	76.5	100.0*	100.0*	79.0	78.9	83.8*
AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS:						
Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	48.0	50.0	49.4	57.9*	52.6*	47.3
AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated						
	69.9	66.6	70.1	86.0*	72.8	74.8
MANAGERIAL METHODS: Percentage of Managerial Methods Used						
	73.3	72.9	75.9*	77.4*	75.3	76.2*
MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used						
	70.8	70.8	72.8	73.0	71.2	74.1*
ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used						
	89.7	91.1	91.7	92.8	100.0*	89.9
ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collection Methods Used						
	72.6	82.4	79.5*	76.3	71.1	100.0*
Number of States	51	51	39	38	38	37

\*The mean for this state subgroup is significantly different from the mean for the remaining states at the 90 percent level (one-tailed test).

descriptive typology and the descriptive typology used to define the subgroup under consideration. Thus, the related descriptive typologies could be used to distinguish more concisely among different types of claims collection systems.

As shown in the table, only limited correlation exists among the eight descriptive typologies. The subgroup of states with highly centralized claims collection processes indicates that a significant association exists between the extent to which the claims process is centralized and the use of specialized staff to operate the claims processes. All of the states with highly centralized claims processes use specialized staff at the establishment and collection stages of the process, while about 77 percent of all states do so. Other significant relationships which can be observed in Table III.4 include the tendency of states which use specialized staff to rely more on the managerial methods that are included in the descriptive typologies, and to be more likely to use at least one alternative collection technique. In addition, states that have relatively high levels of automation use more managerial methods.

Although a simple classification scheme that captures the wide variation in the states' claims collection processes does not appear to be available, it is perhaps useful to consider where states fall within an arbitrary classification scheme that focuses on a limited set of distinguishing characteristics. The characteristics selected--the extent to which the claims process is centralized, the use of automation, and the use of managerial and monitoring methods--are among those believed to be closely associated with the effectiveness and efficiency of the claims collection process. However, because numerous other factors may affect the claims collection system, this attempt at classifying the states' claims processes should be viewed simply as one method for distinguishing among the types of processes, rather than as an attempt to grade or rate the state agencies. Figure III.1 presents the classification of state claims collection processes based on this three-way classification scheme.

Survey data are used to modify this classification scheme under two circumstances:

1. For the 2 states for which census data were not available--California and North Dakota--the

FIGURE III.1

## THREE-WAY CLASSIFICATION OF STATE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESSES

(1) Centralization of the Claims Collection Process						
(3) Automation of the Claims Collection Process	Substantial District/Region and/or State Involvement		Some District/Region and/or State Involvement		Only Local/County Involvement	
	(2) Use of Managerial and Monitoring Methods		(2) Use of Managerial and Monitoring Methods		(2) Use of Managerial and Monitoring Methods	
	Substantial Use	More Limited Use	Substantial Use	More Limited Use	Substantial Use	More Limited Use
Highly Automated	Arkansas Florida Louisiana Oregon Texas	Alaska Iowa New Mexico	Georgia South Carolina Vermont Washington	Michigan North Carolina	Nevada	
Partially Automated	Connecticut Kansas Kentucky Missouri	Arizona Delaware District of Columbia Illinois Massachusetts Mississippi New Hampshire Oklahoma Pennsylvania Rhode Island Utah Virgin Islands West Virginia	Hawaii Minnesota South Dakota Virginia Wyoming	Indiana Maine Maryland Montana Nebraska North Dakota Tennessee	Alabama Wisconsin	California Colorado New York Ohio
Manual	Guam			Idaho	New Jersey	

NOTES: The breakdowns within the three dimensions of the classification scheme are derived from the descriptive typologies of Table III.1, and are as follows: (1) Centralization of the Claims Collection Process: states with 80 percent or more of their claims process centralized are classified as having "substantial district/region and/or state involvement"; states with no district/region or state-level involvement in their claims process are classified as having "only local/county involvement"; the remaining states are classified as having "some district/region and/or state involvement." (2) Use of Management and Monitoring Methods: states using 80 percent or more of the management methods and 67 percent or more of the monitoring methods are classified as having "substantial use" of management and monitoring methods; the remaining states are classified as having "more limited use." (3) Automation of the Claims Collection Process: states with 75 percent or more of the routine claims functions automated and 100 percent of the case action and claims payment histories automated are classified as having "highly automated" claims collection processes; states with no automation of either claims functions or claims histories are classified as "manual" processes; the remaining states are classified as having "partially automated" claims collection processes.

available survey data (summarized in Appendix Table B.1) were used to characterize the general system of claims collection activities within those states.

2. When the state reported little or no automation or limited use of managerial and monitoring methods, but the local offices reported that they were performing those functions, we used the local agency data to create a more indepth profile of claims collection operations within the states. Consequently, the placements of 3 states (Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin) within the classification framework were changed to capture local-level activity in automation and managerial methods.

#### C. RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Using two of the rough measures of effectiveness from Appendix Table A.17, we have constructed two indices of the relative effectiveness of the states' claims collection processes.<sup>3/</sup> The two indices are (1) states whose two effectiveness measures were above their respective median values and (2) states whose two effectiveness measures were not above their respective median values. Thus, the first index identifies states which appear to be particularly successful at claims collection, while the second identifies states which appear to be less successful. In Table III.5, subgroups of states defined on the basis of these two indices are examined to determine whether any of the descriptive typologies distinguish between the relatively effective or less effective systems.

Not surprisingly, given the poor quality of the effectiveness data, a close relationship does not appear to exist between any of the characteristics included in the descriptive typologies and measures of the effectiveness of claims collection. The descriptive typologies do not distinguish between states which are successful relative to all other states and states which are less successful relative to all other states. Nor

---

<sup>3/</sup> The two measures from Appendix Table A.17 are the value of claims established for each \$100 of food stamps issued in error and the value of claims collected for each \$100 of claims established.

TABLE III.5

DISTRIBUTION OF STATES AND RESPONSE VALUES FOR DESCRIPTIVE  
 TYPOLOGIES BY ROUGH MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff in Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action/Payment Histories Automated	MANAGERIAL METHODS: Percentage of Managerial Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collection Methods Used
States with Both Effectiveness Measures Above the Median Values <sup>a</sup>								
Guam	100	100	0	0	80	67	100	0
Iowa	100	100	75	100	80	33	50	100
Kansas	80	0	50	100	80	67	100	100
Maine	20	0	50	67	40	67	100	0
Nevada	0	100	75	100	80	67	100	100
New Hampshire	100	100	0	0	80	67	100	100
North Carolina	20	0	75	100	60	67	100	100
Oregon	100	100	75	100	100	100	100	100
South Dakota	60	100	50	100	100	100	100	100
Utah	80	100	50	67	60	67	100	100
Mean Response Value	61	70	50	73	76	70	95	80
States with Neither Effectiveness Measure Above the Median Values								
Colorado	0	100	50	0	60	100	75	100
District of Columbia	100	100	50	100	60	67	100	100
Florida	100	100	75	100	100	100	100	100
Michigan	50	0	75	100	80	33	100	100
Minnesota	20	100	25	100	80	67	25	100
New Mexico	80	100	100	100	80	33	100	0
New York	0	100	50	100	60	67	100	100

TABLE III.5 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff in Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action/Payment Histories Automated	MANAGERIAL METHODS: Percentage of Managerial Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collection Methods Used
Ohio	0	100	100	0	0	60	100	100100
Pennsylvania	100	100	100	25	100	60	67	50100
Rhode Island	90	100	100	50	100	60	100	1000
Wyoming	50	100	100	25	100	100	67	75100
Virgin Islands	100	100	100	100	0	40	67	1000
Mean Response Value	58	92	92	52	75	70	72	8575

SOURCE: Table III.2 and Appendix Table A.17 contain the detailed information on which this table is based.

<sup>a</sup>North Dakota is also among the states with both effectiveness measures above the median values; however, because census data were not available for North Dakota, the state was not included in this table.





#### IV. NATIONAL OVERVIEW OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

In addition to completing the descriptive profiles of the states' claims collection systems, and confirming or modifying the placement of states within the classification typologies, we used the survey data to develop a nationally representative picture of various claims collection processes, useful both as a profile of processes about which little was known previously and as a guide for the FSPOS Phase III intensive assessments.

Section A of this chapter reviews the procedures used to select the survey sample. The next three sections discuss, respectively, the organization of the claims collection process vis a vis the national caseload; the level of automation in the local FSAs; the use of managerial and monitoring tools, as well as various methods for detecting overissuances in the local FSAs. Finally, Section E outlines possible issues for further assessment in the area of claims collection in the third phase of the FSPOS project.

##### A. SELECTION OF THE LOCAL FSA SAMPLE

A local FSA sample of adequate size was essential for generating accurate estimates of the proportion of the national caseload administered by local FSAs which use particular claims collection methods. As discussed in Chapter I of this report, a stratified random sample of 187 local FSAs was drawn from a universe of approximately 2,900 local FSAs. The selection probability for each local FSA was proportional to the size of its household caseload within its respective state. The population of local FSAs was stratified by state in order to provide some confirmation of the claims collection approach used at the local level as reported in the census by states which exhibited little local variation, and to improve the efficiency of the sample estimates of the different claims collection approaches that were reported in the census by states which exhibited substantial variation at the local level. The overall efficiency of the sample was further enhanced by allocating about 75 percent of the sample to the strata which exhibited substantial variation at the local level. Either 2 or 5 local FSAs were selected from each

state. The selection of 2 local agencies from states which exhibited little variation at the local level was expected to be sufficient to confirm the census-based profile. The selection of 5 local agencies from states which exhibited substantial variation was expected to be sufficient to satisfy the descriptive requirements of the study, although the standard errors at the individual state level would be large. The precision requirements for drawing national-level estimates (accurate to within 10 percent of the true population percentage) can easily be met with the total of 187 sites selected under this plan.<sup>1/</sup>

While the loss of data for 16 local FSAs due to interview refusals is unfortunate (particularly in terms of developing the descriptive profiles of those states), and may inject some nonresponse bias into the national estimates, the 171 local FSAs for which data are available is still a sufficient basis for deriving national estimates. In fact, the unavailability of data for the 16 local FSAs represents only about 1 percent of the caseload of the total number of local FSAs.

#### B. ORGANIZATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

As shown in Table IV.1, the level of responsibility for claims collection activities rests largely with the local agencies. For all stages of the claims collection process following claims referral (that is, investigation, establishment, collections, follow-up, suspension, and termination), the local agencies alone are responsible for about 53 percent of the caseload. State-only responsibility accounts for about 1 percent of the caseload, while the claims of 46 percent of the caseload are the responsibility of various combinations of state, district, and/or local agencies.

As noted in Chapter II, responsibility for claims collection shifts somewhat to state FSAs as higher-level stages (that is, collections, follow-up, suspensions, and terminations) are reached in the claims collection process. State FSAs are solely responsible for postestablishment functions for about 11 percent of the caseload (an increase of about 10 percentage points from

---

<sup>1/</sup>See Appendix C for the rationale behind the survey sample selection procedures.

TABLE IV.1

ORGANIZATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS:  
PERCENT OF CASELOAD IN LOCAL AGENCIES  
WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Percent of Caseload
Structure of Food Stamp Program	
State-administered	38
State-supervised/county-administered	62
Level of Responsibility for Claims Collection Process--	
Following Claims Referral:	
Local/county only	53
Local/county and district/region and/or state	46
District/region and/or state only	1
Following Claims Establishment:	
Local/county only	58
Local/county and district/region and/or state	31
District/region and/or state only	11
Specialized Staff	
Claims/collections staff or unit	79
Fraud/investigations staff or unit	83
Food Stamps Claims Collections Integrated with:	
AFDC	83
Medicaid	31
General Assistance	69
Any of the above	83

state-only responsibility for all stages following referral); local agencies have sole responsibility for postestablishment functions for the majority of cases.

In addition to the centralization of the later stages of the claims collection process at the state level, the activities of the claims collection process are often concentrated in local agencies through the efforts of specialized staff or units.

Specialized staff include claims/collections staff and fraud/investigations staff who are responsible for functions specific to the claims process. Claims or collections staff are specialized staff within the FSA who focus on both fraud and nonfraud claims at any stage of the claims collection process; fraud or investigations staff focus primarily on investigating and establishing cases of suspected fraud. These specialized staff may be workers who have specifically defined responsibilities within the local office or may be part of specialized units at the local, regional, and/or state level.

Specialized staff in the local agencies are involved in various stages of the claims collection process and have diverse responsibilities. As shown in Table IV.1, claims/collections staff or units handle some aspect of the claims process for about 79 percent of the caseload that are covered by the local agencies; specialized fraud or investigations staff handle some aspect of the claims process for 83 percent of the caseload covered by the local agencies.

The organization of the claims collection process also varies in terms of the extent to which the food stamp claims process is integrated with the claims processes of other programs (i.e., AFDC, Medicaid, and General Assistance). High levels of program integration may facilitate detecting overissuances more efficiently and may reduce the administrative costs of the food stamp claims collection process.

Local FSAs that represent 83 percent of the national caseload integrate food stamp claims collection with AFDC claims processes. In fact, if program integration occurs at all at the local level, the food stamp claims process is always integrated with the AFDC claims process at the very least. Food stamp and General Assistance claims processes are integrated in local

offices that cover 69 percent of the caseload. Food stamp and Medicaid processes are integrated far less frequently.

#### C. AUTOMATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

Automation of the claims collection process is quite widespread in the local offices and supports most of the national caseload. As indicated in Table IV.2, 83 percent of the national caseload are covered by local agencies in which some or all of the claims collection process is automated; these automated systems are often the systems that are made available by the state to the local offices. The functions performed most frequently by the automated systems are the recoupment amount calculation and the deduction of the recoupment amount from the food stamp issuance. Nearly one-half of the caseload are covered by local offices whose available automated systems calculate the overissuance amount. The generation of demand letters is the function performed least often by the automated systems available in the local FSAs.

However, the census and survey data may somewhat underreport the level of automation in the local agencies, particularly for calculating the recoupment amount and deducting the recoupment from the food stamp issuance, two functions that are also frequently performed by an agency's automated food stamp certification system. Such underreporting may have occurred due to the separate questions in the claims survey instrument on automated claims processes and automated food stamp certification systems. While the interview instruments do not differentiate between the two types of automated systems in questions on the automation of specific claims functions, a comparison of census data on automated certification systems with census and survey data on claims collection suggests that the

TABLE IV.2

AUTOMATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS:  
PERCENT OF CASELOAD IN LOCAL AGENCIES  
WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Percent of Caseload
Claims Collection Process is Automated	
Yes	83
No	17
Functions Performed by the Automated System:	
Calculation of overissuance amount <sup>a</sup>	44,45
Calculation of recoupment amount	65
Deduction of recoupment from issuance	77
Generation of demand letters <sup>a</sup>	20,21
Maintenance of history of:	
Case actions	
All actions	13
Most recent actions only	26
Recoupment	54
Other claims payments	31
Claims suspensions	49

<sup>a</sup>The first figure is for fraud (or suspected fraud) cases, the second for nonfraud cases.

distinction may have been made in some cases.<sup>2/</sup> However, the differences in the reported availability of automation for various functions do not contradict the general profile of highly automated functions in the claims collection processes of local agencies.

The automated systems reported on by the local FSAs are less likely to perform managerial functions, such as maintaining a history of the dates of various actions taken on overissuances and claims. As shown in Table IV.2, local agencies which maintain an automated history of either recoupment dates or claims suspensions cover approximately one-half of the national caseload. Local offices that maintain data on other claims payments in their automated systems cover less than one-third of the caseload. Dates of case actions are maintained by local agencies less frequently, although local agencies are twice as likely to hold dates of the latest overissuance and claims actions than to hold dates for all such actions.

#### D. MANAGING THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS

The ability of local, district, and state FSAs to manage the claims collection process across different office levels that are involved in various claims functions may depend in part on the use of certain managerial and monitoring tools which might be expected to contribute to the effectiveness of the process.

The managerial tools reported on by the local FSAs, and examined in this section, include: internal reports; staff training, established time limits, and manuals on the policies and procedures of the claims collection process; and methods for monitoring aspects of individual claims cases.

<sup>2/</sup> Automated certification systems (ACSs) were one of the topic areas covered in the census of state FSAs. A comparison of census data on ACSs with census data on claims collection activities reveals some variations. ACS census data, for example, indicate that automated food stamp certification systems calculate the recoupment amount in 14 states in which claims census respondents indicate that the automated systems do not calculate the amount.



### Internal Reports

Summary reports are widely used managerial tools among local FSAs. As shown in Table IV.3, officials from local agencies which represent the majority of the national caseload indicate that routine summary reports are prepared by either the state or local agency, or both. These reports assess the efficacy of various stages of the claims collection process and often communicate information on the claims process among the state, district, and local units involved in the process. Officials from local agencies that cover about 84 percent of the caseload indicate that summary reports are prepared by their respective state FSA; 77 percent of the caseload are covered by local agencies in which the reports are prepared by the local offices. That 63 percent of the caseload are represented by local agencies in which claims reports are prepared by both the state FSA and the local office might indicate that summary reports are perceived as useful managerial tools at the state and local levels, and that they are not strictly a functional responsibility of either FSA level.

Routine reporting on the status of individual cases with overissuances and claims receives less attention as a managerial tool, and functional responsibility for preparing those reports is shared less often by state and local FSAs. Local offices for 57 percent of the caseload indicate that status reports are prepared by the state agencies, while about 47 percent of the caseload are covered by local offices which prepare the status reports at the local level. Local offices that cover 19 percent of the caseload share responsibility with their respective state agency for preparing status reports.

### Staff Training, Written Manuals, and Time Limits

As shown in Table IV.3, staff training and the availability of written policy and procedures manuals pertaining specifically to the claims process are reported to be widely used managerial tools in the local offices. Staff training is provided in local agencies that represent 97 percent of the national caseload. As was discussed in Chapter II, the training is provided most frequently for new employees, while refresher training and retraining (following rules changes, for example) are provided for existing staff when necessary. Staff training in the local offices tends to examine the entire range of topics: claims referrals,

TABLE IV.3  
MANAGEMENT OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS:  
PERCENT OF CASELOAD IN LOCAL AGENCIES  
WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Percent of Caseload
Routine Summary Reports Prepared by:	
State agency	84
Local agency	77
Both	63
Neither	2
Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared by:	
State agency	57
Local agency	47
Both	19
Neither	15
Training in Claims Collection Processes and Procedures Provided	97
Written Manual on Claims Collection Available to Staff	98
Establishing Time Limits for Processing Claims in:	
State agency	39
Local agency	60
Both	24
Neither	26
Established Tracking System	
Yes	93
No	7
Do not know	1
Established Tracking System for:	
Computer match hits	63
Other apparent overissuances	69
Referrals <sup>a</sup>	59,58
Investigations <sup>a</sup>	72,69
Established claims <sup>a</sup>	75,86
Claims collections	85
Suspended claims <sup>a</sup>	73,76
Disqualified individuals	88

TABLE IV.3 (continued)

Characteristic	Percent of Caseload
Tracking System Is Automated	
Yes	81
No	19
Established System for Signalling Staff that a Case Requires Further Attention	
Yes	92
No	8
System of Flags Is Automated	
Yes	70
No	30
Established System for Sorting Claims by Their Chronological Age	
Yes	15
No	85
System for Aging Is Automated	
Yes	8
No	92

<sup>a</sup>The first figure is for fraud (or suspected fraud) cases, the second for nonfraud cases.

the detection of overissuances, the prevention of overissuances, investigations, and food stamp regulations and laws.

Written manuals which provide information on the policies and procedures of the claims collection process are available to the office staff of local agencies that represent 98 percent of the national caseload.

Establishing time limits to control the processing of various claims collection activities may be effective at reducing the backlogs of potential claims. As shown in Table IV.3, time limits are used more often by local agencies than by state agencies. Officials from local agencies that cover 60 percent of the national caseload report that time limits are used by those offices; officials from local agencies that cover only 39 percent of the caseload report that their state FSA use time limits to control claims collection activities.

#### Monitoring Methods

Three primary methods are used by state and local FSAs to monitor the progress of individual overissuances and claims: established processes for tracking overissuances or claims; systems for signalling workers that certain cases require further action; and methods that sort and report on overissuances or claims based on their chronological ages.

As shown in Table IV.3, systems that track the status of individual overissuances and claims through at least part of the claims collection process are used by local agencies that represent 93 percent of the national caseload. Most of those systems (81 percent) are partially or totally automated. Greater than 75 percent of the caseload are covered by local agencies which track disqualified individuals, claims collections, and established claims. Approximately 11 percent more of the caseload are covered by local agencies which track established claims on nonfraud cases (86 percent) than local agencies which track established claims on fraud cases (75 percent). The wide percentage difference may be due to the fact that responsibility for establishing claims (particularly for fraud cases) often rests at the state rather than at the local level, and that tracking systems, in general, tend to be more common in state than in local offices.

Established systems that flag cases for the requisite staff are available to local agencies that represent 92 percent of the national caseload. As is the case with

tracking systems, the majority (70 percent) of the flagging systems are automated.

Processes that sort and report on overissuances and claims according to their chronological ages may be important in terms of evaluating the timeliness of various stages of the process, determining when prompts for action are necessary on pending cases at various stages of the process, and facilitating the efficient execution of claims collection operations. Of the three monitoring tools examined, systems for aging claims affect the fewest households, according to national estimates. Only about 15 percent of the national caseload are represented by local offices which have an established system, either manual or automated, for aging claims. Unlike the state aging systems, which tend to be automated (as noted in Chapter II), local offices that represent only 8 percent of the caseload use automated aging systems.

#### Detecting Overissuances

In the first stage of the claims collection process, overissuances are discovered, and steps are taken to initiate the claims process. Various detection methods are used by agencies to identify the overissuances, some perceived to be more effective than others.

Table IV.4 shows that local agencies are likely to use most of the detection methods available to them. Nearly all (more than 99 percent) of the caseload are represented by local agencies that use hotlines and informal complaint systems, Quality Control (QC) and recertification reviews, and conflicting information from the recipient to detect overissuances. In addition, greater than 90 percent of the caseload are represented by local offices which use computer matches of wages and unearned income, duplicate participation checks, conflicting information from other agencies, and supervisory reviews to identify the overissuance. Other methods that are used nearly as often include special investigation units and internal audits. Computer matches of resources and error-prone profiles are used less frequently than the other methods, but are still used by local offices that represent over one-half of the national caseload.

While nearly all available detection methods are used, the methods ranked by local offices as among the more effective include only a few of those available approaches. Local agencies that cover 78 percent of the national caseload rank computer matches of wages among the three most effective detection methods. In

TABLE IV.4

METHODS USED TO DETECT OVERISSUANCES:  
PERCENT OF CASELOAD IN LOCAL AGENCIES  
WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Percent of Caseload
Using the Detection Method:	
Computer Matching on	
Wages	98
Unearned income	91
Resources	60
Duplicate Participation Check	92
Error-Prone Profile	56
Hotline/Informal Complaint	100
Internal Audit	86
QC Review	100
Recertification Review	99
Special Investigation Unit	90
Information from Other Agencies	97
Information from Recipient	99
Supervisory Reviews	96
Other <sup>a</sup>	4
Ranking the Detection Method Among the Three Most Effective:	
Computer Matching on Wages	78
Computer Matching on Unearned income	54
Recertification Review	52
Error-Prone Profile	21
QC Review	13
Special Investigation Unit	13
Information from Recipient	11
Hotline/Informal Complaint	8
Supervisory Reviews	6
Duplicate Participation Check	4
Internal Audit	3
Information from Other Agencies	3
Computer Matching on Resources	2
Other <sup>a</sup>	2

<sup>a</sup>Includes day-to-day activities of the caseworker, reference checks, random home visits, employment program, peer review, monthly reporting, and external audits.

addition, greater than 50 percent of the caseload are represented by local agencies which rank computer matches of unearned income and recertification reviews among the three most effective. Error-prone profiles rank among the three most effective methods in local offices that cover 21 percent of the caseload.

#### E. ISSUES FOR FURTHER ASSESSMENT

The census of state agencies and the survey of local offices provide a clear picture, not previously available, of how the states operate their claims collection processes. However, this picture is incomplete without an understanding of the costs and effectiveness of the various approaches used by the states to collect claims. Thus, the following are four possible directions that FNS might want to pursue in the intensive assessment phase of the FSPOS project in the area of claims collection: an examination of the specific characteristics of the claims systems that are thought to be associated with lower costs and greater effectiveness of claims collection activities; an examination of the costs and effectiveness of types of claims systems (e.g., highly centralized and automated systems that utilize a number of managerial tools); case studies of particularly noteworthy claims systems; and in-depth examinations of particular components of the claims collection process (e.g., the level and extent of automation).

#### Character- istics Associated with Costs and Effec- tiveness

Selected organizational and managerial characteristics of claims collection systems believed to be associated with the efficiency and effectiveness of the claims system are examined throughout this report. Unfortunately, the limited data available from the census and survey make it difficult to clearly examine the relationship between a characteristic of the claims collection process and its effectiveness.

Thus, one question might form a useful starting point for the intensive assessment phase of the FSPOS project: What specific characteristics of the claims collection process are associated with lower costs or more effective claims processes? This approach would of course require in-depth information on the costs and effectiveness of systems, as well as information from a large number of sites, in order to derive and then estimate the desired statistical models adequately.

Types of  
Processes  
Associated  
with Costs  
and Effec-  
tiveness

A less resource-intensive approach than developing statistical models would address a similar question: Are certain types of claims collection processes more or less expensive and/or more or less effective than other types? A limited number of categories of claims collection processes could be identified based on the descriptive typology developed from the census and survey data. The characteristics that could be selected for creating the typology--the extent to which the claims process is centralized, the use of automation, and the use of managerial and monitoring methods--are among those believed to be associated with the effectiveness and efficiency of the claims collection process. Thus, categories of claims systems might include, for example, a group of states characterized by a high degree of state involvement in the claims process, highly automated systems, and heavy reliance on managerial and monitoring tools; a group of states in which the local agencies are involved primarily in claims activities, manual claims systems are used, and managerial and monitoring tools are relied on less heavily; and groups of states which exhibit other combinations of these characteristics.



process would be identified as the least expensive and/or most effective claims collection process.<sup>3/</sup> Since this qualitative approach would focus on relatively few sites, little, if anything, could be said about the degree to which any findings apply to the universe of claims collection processes. However, this approach may provide FNS with important, if tentative, information on what different processes are likely to cost and how effective they can be.

#### Case Studies of Effective Local Systems

The third possible focus for the intensive assessments might include indepth case studies of a limited number of sites selected because certain aspects of their claims collection operations appear to be particularly effective. The intensive assessments would focus on measuring the costs and effectiveness of these exemplary systems, as well as providing systematic descriptions of their organizations and operations. The indepth studies of particularly effective local agency claims collection systems may provide valuable guidance to officials in states that are considering changes in their claims collection systems.

Unfortunately, little information is available from the census, survey, or other sources to help identify particularly promising systems. Without conducting a study similar to either of the two possible directions discussed above, not enough data are available to identify the more promising claims collection approaches. However, case studies of exemplary systems may be considered an appropriate extension to the analysis of data following either of the preceding two assessment alternatives.

---

<sup>3/</sup>This comparison requires that the descriptive typologies used to categorize the sites distinguish between the important differences in the claims collection approaches. To the extent that unmeasured factors affect the cost and/or effectiveness of the claims process (e.g., staff morale), the comparison across typologies may mistakenly attribute the differences in the costs and/or effectiveness of the systems to the wrong characteristics. Detailed descriptions of the operation of the claims collection process by the sites in the sample will help identify any factors not incorporated in the descriptive typologies.

In Depth  
Examination  
of Single  
Components  
of Claims  
Process

Finally, the intensive assessment phase might examine in detail one particular aspect of the claims collection process. For example, since increased automation of the claims collection process is viewed as one factor that contributes to a system that is both more efficient and less expensive, the use of automation by the FSAs could be the focus of indepth study.

The analyses of the census and survey data on claims collection processes, and the comparison of those data with census data on automated certification systems, clearly indicate that state and local systems vary widely in terms of the level and extent of automation available in the local offices. The level of computer automation to support claims collection activities varies from state to state and county to county; functions range from automatically computing the overpayment amount to monitoring the timely follow-up of each step in the claims collection process. A more extensive examination of selected local FSA automated systems may provide a clearer picture of state and local systems--whether such systems are separate from the agency's automated food stamp certification system, and, if so, what claims functions are performed by which system. Further activities in the intensive assessment of automated systems might include the following:

- o Based on structured discussions with agency staff, determining the relative importance of each automated function in terms of contributing to an effective claims collection process
- o Based on the features identified in (1), identifying those sites which currently use the most sophisticated automated functions
- o Developing a clear nontechnical report that describes the issues that are being addressed by the automated system, as well as how it works and its perceived benefits
- o Developing clear functional descriptions for the most effectively implemented system identified. These functional descriptions could then be used by other sites to guide them in adopting similar automated features.

## REFERENCES

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. State Tables of Activity Ranking, Plus. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, April 1986.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General. Management of Food Stamp Claims. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 1985.

## APPENDIX A

## APPENDIX A

### CHAPTER II SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

#### NOTES:

1. In the census of state FSAs, states were asked to report on the claims collection process in the majority of their counties. In the survey of local FSAs, local agencies were asked comparable questions as they applied to that agency. As a result, table entries may appear inconsistent; that is, a particular local agency may report state involvement on a claims function while the state may report generally local involvement (and vice versa). Although the local FSAs selected for the survey were not representative samples within the states, to the extent that the survey data supplement the census data, the survey data should be viewed as refining the states' descriptive profiles. In the 2 states for which census data were not available (California and North Dakota), the survey data should be viewed as the general characterization of the states' claims collection process.
2. Three survey questionnaires were administered to the local agencies, two of which repeated all of the questions related to the table entries. Because the third questionnaire was administered to local FSAs in 14 states where the claims collection process is predominantly state-operated, it is an abbreviated version of the other survey questionnaires. Consequently, some questions in the tables are not relevant for some local agencies. Questions which are not relevant are noted by "\*\*\*" in the tables.
3. In general, local FSAs were asked to report on activities they performed, and not on state-level functions. As a result, some questions were not applicable to a particular local office. These questions are noted by "NA" in the tables, and, where appropriate, are explained further in table footnotes.
4. The question numbers noted in each table relate to the relevant question in the state census questionnaire. (Questions comparable to those in the census instrument, where relevant, appear in each of the survey instruments.)

TABLE A.1

ORGANIZATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections Staff or Unit	Fraud/ Investigations Staff or Unit
		Suspected											
		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Alabama	Yes	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	
Bibb		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Etowah		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	S
Franklin		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	S
Mobile		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S
Morgan		L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Alaska	No	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Anchorage-Muldoon		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Ketchikan		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Arizona	No	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L,S	S
Maricopa		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	
Navajo		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		L
Arkansas	No	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Clay		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Phillips		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
*California	Yes												
Los Angeles		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L
San Bernardino		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L
San Joaquin		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L

\* Sonoma

\* Yolo

TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections	Fraud/ Investigations
		Suspected										Staff or Unit	Staff or Unit
Colorado	Yes	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Boulder		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	
Denver		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Gunnison-Hinsdale		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L
* Mesa													
Pueblo		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Connecticut	No	S	L,S	S	L,S	S	S	S	S	L,S	L,S	L,D,S	S
* New Haven													
* Torrington													
Delaware	No	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
New Castle		L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Sussex		L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	No	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Florida	No	S	D	S	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D,S	D
Dade		L,S	L	S	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	L		L
Polk		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L
Georgia	Yes	L,S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L		S
Bibb		L,S	L	S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L,D,S
Colquitt		S	L	S	L	L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L,D
Fulton		S	L	S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,D
Madison		L,S	L	S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L		D
* Peach													
Guam <sup>a</sup>	No	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Hawaii	No	L,S	L	S	L	S	S	S	S	NA <sup>b</sup>	NA <sup>b</sup>		S
Honolulu		L,S	L	S	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	NA	NA		
Maui		L,S	L	S	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	NA	NA		

TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations Suspected		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections Staff or Unit	Fraud/ Investigations Staff or Unit
		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Idaho	No	L,S	L	L	L	L,D	L,D	L,D	L,D	L,D	L,D	L,D	L,D,S
* Ada													
* Bonneville													
* Canyon													
* Owyhee													
* Shoshone													
Illinois	No	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Cook Co. (Ashland)		L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Cook Co. (Englewood)		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L,S
Cook Co. (Garfield)		L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L,S
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)		L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Greene		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Indiana	Yes	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	
Adams		L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S		
Allen		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Marion		L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	L
Scott		L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	L	L		
Wayne		L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	S,L	L
Iowa	No	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Iowa		L	L	L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Webster		L,D	L,D	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Kansas	No	L,D	L	D	L	L,D,S	L,S	D,S	S	S	S		D
Cherokee		L,D	L	L,D	L	L,D,S	L,S	L,D,S	L,S	S	S		D
Franklin		L,D	L,D	L,D	L	L,D,S	L,S	D,S	S	S	S		D
Linn		L,D	L	L,D	L	L,D	L	D,S	S	S	S		D
Wichita		L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	L
Wyandotte		L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	S	S	S	S	L



TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections	Fraud/ Investigations
		Suspected										Staff or Unit	Staff or Unit
		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Kentucky	No	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	S
Bell		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	S
Carter		L,S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	L,D,S	S
Hart		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Jefferson		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	L	L,S
Todd		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	D,S	S
Louisiana	No	L,D	L,D	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	D,S
Caddo		L,D	L,D	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
Lincoln		L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
Orleans		L,D	L,D	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S,D	L
St. Tammany		L,D	L,D	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
Tangipahoa		L,D	L,D	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L
Maine	No	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	S	S	S
Augusta		L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	
Lewiston		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Maryland	Yes	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L,S
Allegany		L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	L	L		L,S
Baltimore City		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S
Baltimore Co.		L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L		L,S
Frederick		L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Montgomery		L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	
Massachusetts	No	S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Malden		S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		S
Roslindale		S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	

TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations Suspected		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections	Fraud/ Investigations
		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Staff or Unit	Staff or Unit
Michigan	No	S	L	S	L,S	L	L	S	S	L	L	L,S	L,S
Berrien		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L,S
Branch		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	L	L,S
Macomb		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	L	L	L	L
St. Clair		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L
Wayne		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S
Minnesota	Yes	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L
Clay		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Dakota		L,S	L	S	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S		
Hennepin		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S		L
Ramsey		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L
Waseca		L,S	L	NA <sup>d</sup>	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Mississippi	No	L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	L,S	L	L	S	S	L,S	S
Attala		L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S		
Hinds		L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	L,S	L	L	S	S	L,S	L
Lowndes		L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S		L
Madison		L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	L,S	L	L	S	S	S	L
Tishomingo		L	L	S	S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S		
Missouri	No	L	L	D,S	D,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S		D
Buchanan		S	L	S	L	S	S	L,S	L,S	S	S	L	S
Jackson		L,S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	L,S	S
Lafayette		L,S	L	S	S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S		S
Pettis		L,S	L	S	L,S	L,S	L,S	DK	DK	L,S	L,S		S
St. Louis		L,S	L	S	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	L,S	L,S
Montana	Yes	L	L	L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
Cascade		L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S		L
Lewis & Clark		L,S	L,S	S	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S		L

TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections	Fraud/ Investigations
		Suspected										Staff or Unit	Staff or Unit
		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Nebraska	No	L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L	S	L	S	L,S		S
Grand Island		L,S	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S		
Lexington		L,S	L	S	S	L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L,S
Lincoln		L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	L	S	S		
Omaha		L,S	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L,S
Seward		L,S	L	L	L,S	S	L	S	L	S	L		
Nevada	No	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L
Clark		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L
Washoe		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	
New Hampshire	No	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Dover		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Keene		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
New Jersey	Yes	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Burlington		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Camden		L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L
Essex		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Hudson		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Middlesex		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
New Mexico	No	L,S	L	L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Bernalillo		L,S	L	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Cibola		L,S	L	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S		S
New York	Yes	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L
* Broome													
Cortland		L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	
Erie		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L
New York City		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
* Onondaga													

TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections	Fraud/ Investigations
		Suspected										Staff or Unit	Staff or Unit
North Carolina	Yes	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L
Craven		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Forsyth		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	
Halifax		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	
Haywood		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Yancey		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
*North Dakota	Yes												
Cass		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Emmons		L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Grand Forks		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S		
Mountrail		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Stutsman		L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Ohio	Yes	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S	
Cuyahoga		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Delaware		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Franklin		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Mahoning		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Richland		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L
Oklahoma	No	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Carter		L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Custer		L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Oregon	No	L,D,S	L,D	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	D,S	
Albany		L,D,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L,S	
Cottage Grove		L,D,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
East Portland		L,D,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
Springfield		L,S	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L,S	
West Eugene		L,D,S	L,D	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	

TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations Suspected		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections Staff or Unit	Fraud/ Investigations Staff or Unit
		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Pennsylvania	No	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L,S	
Lycoming		L	L	L,S	S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S		S
Philadelphia (Center)		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		S
Philadelphia (Ogontz)		L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		S
Philadelphia (West)		L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		S
Westmoreland		L,S	L	L,S	S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S		
Rhode Island	No	L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Providence		L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Warwick		L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
South Carolina	Yes	L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	
Darlington		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Georgetown		L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S
Newberry		L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Orangeburg		L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	
Richland		L,S	L	L,D	L	L,D	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,S
South Dakota	No	L	L	L	L	D,S	D,S	D,S	D,S	S	S	L,D,S	
Bennett		L	L	L	L	D,S	D,S	D,S	D,S	S	S		
Davison		L	L	L	L	D,S	D,S	D,S	D,S	S	S		
Tennessee	No	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L,S	L	L,S	L,S		L
Davidson		L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L,S	L	L,D,S	L,D,S	L	L
Sumner		L,D	L	L,D	L,D	L,D	L	L,D,S	L	L,D	L,D	D,S	L,D
Texas	No	D	D	L,D	L,D	S	L,D	S	L,D	S	L	L,D	L,S
* Bexar													
DeWitt		D	L	D	L	D	L	D	L	L	L		L
* Harris													
Smith		S	L	D,S	L	S	L	S	L	S	L		S
Tarrant		L,S	L,S	S	D	L,D	D	L,D	D	NA <sup>C</sup>	NA <sup>C</sup>	D	D

TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations Suspected		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections	Fraud/ Investigations
		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Staff or Unit	Staff or Unit
Utah	No	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L,S	
Region 2B		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Region 7A		L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	
Vermont	No	S	L	L	L	S	S	L	L	L	L		S
Hartford		S	L	L	L	S	S	L	L	L	L		
St. Albans		L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S		
Virginia	Yes	L	L	L,S	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L
Charlotte		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L
Hampton IC		L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L
Norfolk IC		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
* Portsmouth													
Pulaski		L	L	L,S	L	L,S	L	L	L	L	L		L
Virgin Islands <sup>B</sup>	No	L,D	L,D	D	D	D	D	S	S	S	S	D	S
Washington	No	L	L	L,S	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	L,S	S
Benton		L	L	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	S
King-Rainier		L	L	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	D
Pierce		L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S		L
Spokane		L	L	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	S
Vancouver		L	L	L	L	S	S	S	S	S	S	L	L
West Virginia	No	D	D	D	D	S	S	S	S	D	D	S	S
Beckley		D	D	D	D	S	S	S	S	D	D		
Charleston		D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D		
Wisconsin	Yes	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L
Bayfield		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		
Douglas		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		L
Milwaukee		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L,D	L
Rock		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
Sauk		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L		

TABLE A.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	State-Supervised/ County-Administered	Level of Responsibility for Operation of the Claims Process (Q1.00)										Use of Specialized Staff	
		Investigations		Establishment		Collections		Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims		Suspension/Termination		Claims/ Collections	Fraud/ Investigations
		Suspected										Staff or Unit	Staff or Unit
		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Wyoming	No	L	L	L,S	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	L,S	
Carbon		L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Crook		L,S	L	S	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	
Freemont		L	L	L,S	L,S	L,S	L,S	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	L
Matrona		L	L	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S	S	S	S	L
Park		L	L	L,S	L,S	L	L	L,S	L,S	S	S		S

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSA system.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

KEY: Level of Responsibility and Specialized Staff: L = Local

D = District/Region

S = State

NOTES: The claim referral stage of the claim collection process is not included under the table entry "Level of Responsibility" because it is a local/county function in all states. The table entry "Use of Specialized Staff" is drawn from a series of 15 questions which focus on the division of responsibilities for the various stages of the claims process. Those questions are Q5.00, Q5.05, Q5.17, Q5.24, Q6.07, Q6.08, Q7.00, Q7.01, Q8.02, Q8.08a, Q8.08b, Q8.08c, Q9.00, Q9.07, and Q9.13 in the census instrument, and corresponding questions in the survey instrument plus Q1.01.

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>Hawaii does not suspend or terminate claims.

<sup>c</sup>Tarrant County, Texas does not suspend or terminate claims.

<sup>d</sup>Fraud is so seldom suspected, it has never been pursued in this local FSA.

TABLE A.2

INTEGRATION OF THE FOOD STAMP CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS WITH THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS OF OTHER PROGRAMS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Claims Collection Process Is Integrated (Q1.01)	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					Suspension/ Termination
		Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	
Alabama	No						
Bibb	No						
Etowah	Yes	A	A				
Franklin	Yes			A	A		
Mobile	Yes				A		
Morgan	No		A	A			
Alaska	Yes	A	A				
Anchorage-Muldoon	**			A	A	A	A
Ketchikan	**						
Arizona	Yes	A, G	A, G				
Maricopa	**			A, G	A, G	A, G	A, G
Navajo	**						
Arkansas	Yes	A, M, G	A, M, G				
Clay	**			A, M, G	A, M, G	A, M, G	A, M, G
Phillips	**						
*California							
Los Angeles	Yes	A, G	A, G				
San Bernardino	Yes	A	A				
San Joaquin	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
* Sonoma							
* Yolo				A	A	A	A



TABLE A.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Collection Process Is Integrated (Q1.01)	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					
		Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	Suspension/ Termination
Colorado	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M			
Boulder	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Denver	No						
Gunnison-Hinsdale	Yes	A	A				
* Mesa							
Pueblo	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M			
Connecticut	Yes	A	A	A			
* New Haven							
* Torrington							
Delaware	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
New Castle	**						
Sussex	**						
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G				
Florida	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Dade	**						
Polk	**						
Georgia	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Bibb	Yes	A,M	A	A	A	A	A
Colquitt	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	
Fulton	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A	A
Madison	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
* Peach							
Guam <sup>a</sup>	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Hawaii	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	
Honolulu	**						
Maui	**						

TABLE A.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Collection Process Is Integrated (Q1.01)	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					
		Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	Suspension/ Termination
Idaho	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
* Ada							
* Bonneville							
* Canyon							
* Owyhee							
* Shoshone							
Illinois	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Cook Co. (Ashland)	Yes	A,M,G			A,M,G		
Cook Co. (Englewood)	Yes	A,G	A,G				
Cook Co. (Garfield)	Yes	A,G	A,G				
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	Yes	A	A				
Greene	Yes	A	A				
Indiana	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A	A
Adams	No						
Allen	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Marion	Yes			A	A	A	A
Scott	Yes	A	A	A			
Wayne	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Iowa	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Iowa	**						
Webster	**						
Kansas	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G		
Cherokee	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,G	A,G	
Franklin	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G		
Linn	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G		
Wichita	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G			
Wyandotte	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	

TABLE A.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Collection Process Is Integrated	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					
	(Q1.01)	Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	Suspension/ Termination
Kentucky	No						
Bell	No						
Carter	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A		
Hart	No						
Jefferson	Yes	A,M	A	A			
Todd	No						
Louisiana	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Caddo	Yes	A	A				
Lincoln	Yes	A	A				
Orleans	Yes	A,M	A,M				
St. Tammany	Yes	A	A				
Tangipahoa	Yes	A,M	A,M				
Maine	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Augusta	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Lewiston	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Maryland	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Allegany	Yes	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G		
Baltimore City	Yes	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G
Baltimore County	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G
Frederick	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Montgomery	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Massachusetts	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Malden	Yes	A,G					
Roslindale	Yes	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G
Michigan	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	
Berrien	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Branch	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,G	A,G
Macomb	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
St. Clair	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Wayne	Yes	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G

TABLE A.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Collection Process Is Integrated (Q1.01)	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					
		Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	Suspension/ Termination
Minnesota	Yes	A	A,M,G	A	A	A	A
Clay	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,G
Dakota	No						
Hennepin	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	
Ramsey	Yes			A,M,G			
Waseca	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Mississippi	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A	A	A
Attala	Yes	A	A	DK	A	A	
Hinds	No						
Lowndes	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Madison	Yes	A,M	A,M				
Tishomingo	Yes	A,M	A,M		A,M	A,M	
Missouri	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Buchanan	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Jackson	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G				
Lafayette	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Pettis	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G		A,M,G
St. Louis	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G		
Montana	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Cascade	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G		
Lewis & Clark	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G		
Nebraska	No						
Grand Island	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Lexington	Yes	A	A			A	A
Lincoln	Yes	A,M	A,M		A		
Omaha	No						
Seward	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M

TABLE A.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Collection Process Is Integrated (Q1.01)	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					
		Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	Suspension/ Termination
Nevada	No						
Clark	**						
Washoe	**						
New Hampshire	Yes		A,M,G				
Dover	**						
Keene	**						
New Jersey	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Burlington	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Camden	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Essex	No						
Hudson	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G				
Middlesex	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	
New Mexico	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Bernalillo	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Cibola	Yes	A	A	A			
New York	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
* Broome							
Cortland	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Erie	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
New York City	Yes	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G
* Onondaga							
North Carolina	Yes		A,M,G				
Craven	No						
Forsyth	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Halifax	Yes			A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Haywood	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Yancey	No						

TABLE A.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					
	Collection						
	Process Is						
	Integrated						
	(Q1.01)	Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	Suspension/ Termination
*North Dakota							
Cass	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Emmons	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Grand Forks	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	
Mountrail	No						
Stutsman	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Ohio							
Cuyahoga	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A	A,M,G	A,M,G
Delaware	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Franklin	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Mahoning	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Richland	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,G			
Oklahoma							
Carter	**	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Custer	**						
Oregon							
Albany	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Cottage Grove	Yes	A	A				
East Portland	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G				
Springfield	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G			
West Eugene	Yes	A,G	A,G	A,G			
Pennsylvania							
Lycoming	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Philadelphia (Center)	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G				
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	Yes	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G	A,G
Philadelphia (West)	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Westmoreland	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G				

TABLE A.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Collection Process Is Integrated	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					
	(Q1.01)	Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	Suspension/ Termination
Rhode Island	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G		A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Providence	**						
Warwick	**						
South Carolina	No						
Darlington	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A	A,M,G	A,M,G
Georgetown	No						
Newberry	No						
Orangeburg	No						
Richland	No						
South Dakota	Yes	A	A	A	A	A,M	A,M
Bennett	**						
Davison	**						
Tennessee	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Davidson	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	A
Sumner	Yes	A	A	A	A	A	
Texas	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
* Bexar							
DeWitt	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
* Harris							
Smith	No						
Tarrant	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Utah	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Region 2B	**						
Region 7A	**						
Vermont	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Hartford	**						
St. Albans	**						

TABLE A.2 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Collection Process Is Integrated	Stage of the Claims Collection Process (Q1.02)					
	(Q1.01)	Referral	Investigations	Establishment	Collections	Follow-Up for Delinquent Claims	Suspension/ Termination
Virginia	Yes		A,M,G		A,M		
Charlotte	Yes	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M	A,M
Hampton IC	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A	A,M,G	A,M,G
Norfolk IC	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
* Portsmouth							
Pulaski	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	No						
Washington	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G
Benton	Yes	A,G	A,G	A,G			
King-Rainier	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G			
Pierce	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G			
Spokane	Yes	A,M,G	A,M,G	A,M,G			



TABLE A.2 (continued)

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This question was not asked in the interviews with local FSA respondents in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

KEY: Programs: A = AFDC or ADC

M = Medicaid

G = General Assistance or General Relief

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

TABLE A. 3

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AUTOMATED CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
		(Q3.05)	(Q3.07)	(Q3.07)	(Q3.07)	(Q3.08)	Recoupment (Q3.08)	Other Payments (Q3.08)	(Q3.08)
Alabama	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bibb	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Etowah	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes <sup>e</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes
Franklin	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobile	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Morgan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Alaska	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Anchorage-Muldoon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Ketchikan	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes
Arizona	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maricopa	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	DK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Navajo	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clay	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Phillips	No								
*California									
Los Angeles	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Bernardino	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
San Joaquin	No								
* Sonoma									
* Yolo									

TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments Recoupment Other Payments (Q3.08) (Q3.08)		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
Colorado	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Boulder	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Denver	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Gunnison-Hinsdale	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
* Mesa									
Pueblo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
* New Haven									
* Torrington									
Delaware	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
New Castle	Yes	No	DK	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Sussex	No								
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dade	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Polk	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Georgia	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bibb	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>c</sup>	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Colquitt	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Fulton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Madison	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
* Peach									
Guam <sup>a</sup>	No								

TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
							Recoupment (Q3.08)	Other Payments (Q3.08)	
Hawaii	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Honolulu	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Mau	No								
Idaho	No								
* Ada									
* Bonneville									
* Canyon									
* Owyhee									
* Shoshone									
Illinois	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cook Co. (Ashland)	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cook Co. (Englewood)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cook Co. (Garfield)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greene	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indiana	Yes	No	No	No	No	Latest only	No	No	No
Adams	No								
Allen	No								
Marion	No								
Scott	No								
Wayne	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iowa	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Iowa	No								
Webster	No								

TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
							Recoupment (Q3.08)	Other Payments (Q3.08)	
Kansas	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cherokee	No								
Franklin	No								
Linn	No								
Wichita	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Wyandotte	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Kentucky	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Bell	No								
Carter	No								
Hart	No								
Jefferson	No								
Todd	No								
Louisiana	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Caddo	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Lincoln	No								
Orleans	No								
St. Tammany	No								
Tangipahoa	No								
Maine	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Augusta	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Lewiston	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Maryland	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Allegany	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Baltimore City	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Baltimore County	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Frederick	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Montgomery	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No

TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
							Recoupment (Q3.08)	Other Payments (Q3.08)	
Massachusetts	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Malden	Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No	No	No	No
Roslindale	No								
Michigan	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>C</sup>
Berrien	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Branch	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Macomb	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. Clair	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	DK
Wayne	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Minnesota	Yes <sup>d</sup>	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clay	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dakota	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Hennepin	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ramsey	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waseca	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Mississippi	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	DK	Yes <sup>C</sup>
Attala	No								
Hinds	No								
Lowndes	No								
Madison	No								
Tishomingo	No								
Missouri	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Buchanan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Jackson	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Lafayette	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	DK	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pettis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. Louis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
							Recoupment (Q3.08)	Other Payments (Q3.08)	
Montana	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cascade	No								
Lewis & Clark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Nebraska	Yes <sup>d</sup>	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Grand Island	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Lexington	No								
Lincoln	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Omaha	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Seward	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No	No
Nevada	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clark	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washoe	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Dover	No								
Keene	No								
New Jersey	No								
Burlington	No								
Camden	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Essex	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hudson	No								
Middlesex	No								
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bernalillo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Cibola		Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No	No	No

TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments Recoupment Other Payments (Q3.08) (Q3.08)		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
New York	Yes <sup>d</sup>	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
* Broome									
Cortland	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Erie	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
New York City	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
* Onondaga									
North Carolina	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Craven	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Forsyth	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Halifax	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Haywood	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Yancey	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
*North Dakota									
Cass	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Emmons	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Grand Forks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hountrail	No								
Stutsman	No								
Ohio	No								
Cuyahoga	No								
Delaware	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Franklin	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Mahoning	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Richland	No								
Oklahoma	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Carter	No								
Custer	No								



TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments Recoupment Other Payments (Q3.08) (Q3.08)		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
Oregon	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Albany	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Cottage Grove	No								
East Portland	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Springfield	No								
West Eugene	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lycoming	Yes	No	DK	Dk	DK	No	No	No	No
Philadelphia (Center)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Philadelphia (West)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Westmoreland	No								
Rhode Island	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Latest only	Yes	Yes	No
Providence	No								
Warwick	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Darlington	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgetown	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Newberry	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Orangeburg	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Richland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Dakota	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bennett	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Davison	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tennessee	No								
Davidson	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sumner	Yes <sup>9</sup>	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments Recoupment Other Payments (Q3.08) (Q3.08)		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
Texas	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>C</sup>	Latest only <sup>C</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes
* Bexar									
DeWitt	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
* Harris									
Smith	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tarrant	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Utah	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region 2B	Yes	No	Yes <sup>C</sup>	Yes <sup>C</sup>	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region 7A	Yes	No	No	No	DK	No	No	No	No
Vermont	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hartford	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. Albans	Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>C</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Virginia	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Charlotte	No								
Hampton IC	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Norfolk IC	No								
* Portsmouth									
Pulaski	No								
Virgin Islands <sup>B</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Washington	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Benton	No								
King-Rainier	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Pierce	No								
Spokane	No								
Vancouver	No								

TABLE A.3 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Process Is Automated (Q3.09)	Functions Performed by the Automated Claims Collection Process							
		Calculation of Amount of Overissuance (Q3.05)	Calculation of Amount of Recoupment (Q3.07)	Deduction of Recoupment Amount from Issuance (Q3.07)	Generation of Demand Letters (Q3.07)	Maintenance of History of Case Actions (Q3.08)	Maintenance of History of Claims Payments Recoupment Other Payments (Q3.08) (Q3.08)		Maintenance of History of Claims Suspensions (Q3.08)
West Virginia	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Beckley	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Charleston	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Bayfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Douglas	No								
Milwaukee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Latest only	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rock	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Sauk	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wyoming	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Carbon	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Crook	Yes <sup>h</sup>	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Freemont	No								
Matrona	No								
Park	No								

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

DK Information was not available at time of interview.

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>The response is positive for nonfraud overissuances and/or claims only.

<sup>c</sup>The response is positive for fraud (or suspected fraud) overissuances and/or claims only.

<sup>d</sup>The automated claims collection system does not cover the entire state.

<sup>e</sup>Last 3 letters only.

<sup>f</sup>Idaho installed a new computer system in November 1986 that may include some claims collection components.

<sup>g</sup>Automation is limited to the caseworker entering potential claims into a computer link-up with the regional office where the cases are investigated and established.

<sup>h</sup>Automation is limited to selected tracking functions.

TABLE A. 4

THE USE OF SUMMARY AND STATUS REPORTS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
Alabama	Yes	R,E,C,D,S	M	AL,AS,CS	Yes	R,E,D	AL,AS,CL	Yes
Bibb	No				No			
Etowah	No				No			
Franklin	No				No			
Mobile	Yes	E,C	M	CL	No			
Morgan	Yes	C	M	CL	No			
Alaska	Yes	I,C,D,S	M	AS,CS	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,E,D <sup>c</sup>	CS,FS	Yes
Anchorage-Muldoon	**				No			
Ketchikan	**				No			
Arizona	Yes	R,I,E,C,S	M	AL,AS,CL,CS	Yes	R,E,D	AS,CS	Yes
Maricopa	**				No			
Navajo	**				Yes	R	AL	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	AL,AS,CS,FS	Yes	R,E,D	CS,FS	Yes
Clay	**				No			
Phillips	**				No			
*California								
Los Angeles	Yes	E,C,D,S	Q	FL,CL	No			
San Bernardino	Yes	R,I,E,C,D	M	CL	No			
San Joaquin	No				No			
* Sonoma								
* Yolo								

TABLE A.4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
Colorado	Yes	C	M	AS,CL	No			
Boulder	Yes	R,I,E,C,S	M	CL	No			
Denver	Yes	R,I,E,C,S	M	CL	No			
Gunnison-Hinsdale	No				No			
* Mesa								
Pueblo	Yes	E,C,S	M	CL,AL	No			
Connecticut	Yes	R,E,C	M	AL,AS	Yes	E,D	AL,AS	No
* New Haven								
* Torrington								
Delaware	Yes	E,C	M	AS	No			
New Castle	**				No			
Sussex	**				No			
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	AS,CS,FS	No			
Florida	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,I <sup>b</sup> ,E <sup>b</sup> ,C,D,S	M	AS,CD,FD	Yes	E,D	CD	Yes
Dade	**				Yes	R,E,D	CL	Yes
Polk	**				Yes	R,E,D	CL	No
Georgia	Yes	R,I,E,C	M	AL,AS	No			
Bibb	Yes	E,C,D,S	M	CL,AL	Yes	E,D	CL	Yes
Colquitt	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,I <sup>b</sup> ,E,C	M	CL,AL	No			
Fulton	Yes	E,C,S	M	CL,AL	No			
Madison	No				No			
* Peach								
Guam <sup>a</sup>	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	Q	CS,FS	No			

TABLE A. 4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
Hawaii	Yes	I,E,C	M	AS,FS	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,E <sup>b</sup> ,D <sup>b</sup>	FS	Yes
Honolulu	**				No			
Maui	**				No			
Idaho	No				No			
* Ada								
* Bonneville								
* Canyon								
* Owyhee								
* Shoshone								
Illinois	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CS,FS	No			
Cook Co. (Ashland)	Yes	R,I	M	AL	No			
Cook Co. (Englewood)	No				No			
Cook Co. (Garfield)	Yes	R,I	M	AL	No			
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	Yes	I	M	AL,AD	No			
Greene	No				No			
Indiana	Yes	R,I,E,C,D	M,Q	AS	Yes	D	AS	No
Adams	Yes	C	M	AS	No			
Allen	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CL,AS	Yes	R,E,D	CL,AS	No
Marion	Yes	R,I,E,C	M	CL,AL,AS	Yes	E	AS	No
Scott	No				No			
Wayne	Yes	I <sup>b</sup> ,E,C,D,S	M	CL,CS	No			
Iowa	Yes	E,C,D,S	M	AL,AS,CS	Yes	E,D	CS	Yes
Iowa	**				No			
Webster	**				No			

TABLE A. 4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
Kansas	Yes	E,C,D,S	M	AD,AS	Yes	E,D	AL,AD,AS	Yes
Cherokee	No				No			
Franklin	No				No			
Linn	No				Yes	E	AL	No
Wichita	Yes	E,C	M	CL,AL	No			
Wyandotte	Yes	R,I,E,C,D	M	CL,AL,FS	Yes	E,D	AL,FL	Yes
Kentucky	Yes	R,I,E,C,D	M	AS,CS	Yes	R,E	CS	No
Bell	Yes	R,E,C,D	M	CL,AL,CS	Yes	R,E	AL,CS	No
Carter	Yes	R,E,C	M	CD,CS	Yes	R,E	CD,CS	No
Hart	Yes	R,I,E,C	M	CL,CS	Yes	R,E	CS	No
Jefferson	Yes	R,E,C,D	M	AL,FL	No			
Todd	No				Yes	R,E	CD,CS	No
Louisiana	Yes	E,C,D,S	M	CS,FS	Yes	R,E,D	CS,FS	Yes
Caddo	No				No			
Lincoln	No				No			
Orleans	No				No			
St. Tammany	No				No			
Tangipahoa	Yes	R,I	M	AL	No			
Maine	No				No			
Augusta	No				No			
Lewiston	Yes	R,I,E,D,S	M	CL,AL	Yes	E	AL	No
Maryland	No				No			No
Allegany	No				No			
Baltimore City	Yes	C	M	AL	No			
Baltimore County	Yes	R,I,C	M	AL	No			
Frederick	Yes	E,C	M	CL	Yes	D	AL	No
Montgomery	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	AS	No			

TABLE A.4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
Massachusetts	No				Yes	R,E	AL,AS,CS	Yes
Malden	No				No			
Roslindale	No				No			
Michigan	Yes	I,C,D,S	M	AL,AS,CL,CS,FL,FS	Yes	E,D	AL,AS,CL,CS,FL,FS	Yes
Berrien	Yes	R,I <sup>b</sup> ,E,C,D,S	M	AL,FS	No			
Branch	No				No			
Macomb	No				No			
St. Clair	No				No			
Wayne	Yes	C,D,S	M	CL,AL	Yes	E,D	CL,AS	Yes
Minnesota	Yes	E,D,S	M	AL,AS	Yes	E,D	AL	Yes
Clay	Yes	C	M	AL	Yes	R <sup>c</sup> ,E,D	CL	No
Dakota	No				No			
Hennepin	Yes	R,E,C,S	M	AL	Yes	E,D	AL	Yes
Ramsey	No				Yes	E,D	CL	Yes
Waseca	No				No			
Mississippi	Yes	I,E,C,D,S	M	AL,AD,AS,FS	No			
Attala	No				No			
Hinds	No				No			
Lowndes	No				No			
Madison	No				No			
Tishomingo	No				No			
Missouri	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	AL,FD	Yes	R,E,D	AL,FD	Yes
Buchanan	Yes	I	M	AL	No			
Jackson	No				No			
Lafayette	Yes	I	M	CL,AL	No			
Pettis	No				No			
St. Louis	Yes	R,I	M	AL	No			



TABLE A.4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
Montana	Yes	E,C,D,S	M	AL,CS	Yes	E,D	AL	Yes
Cascade	No				No			
Lewis & Clark	No				No			
Nebraska	Yes	R,I,C,D,S	M	AL,AS	Yes	R,E,D	AL,AS	Yes
Grand Island	No				No			
Lexington	No				No			
Lincoln	No				No			
Omaha	Yes	C	M	AL	Yes	R,E,D	CL	Yes
Seward	No				No			
Nevada	No				Yes	E	CL,CS	Yes
Clark	**				No			
Washoe	**				Yes	E,D	CL	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes	R,I,E,C,D	M	AS,CS,FS	No			
Dover	**				No			
Keene	**				No			
New Jersey	Yes	C	M	AS,CL	Yes	R,E,D	AS,CL	Yes
Burlington	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CL,CS,OL <sup>f</sup>	No			
Camden	Yes	R,I,E <sup>b</sup> ,C,S	M	CL,FL,AL	No			
Essex	Yes	R,I,E <sup>b</sup> ,C,D,S	M	AL,AS	No			
Hudson	Yes	C	M	AS	No			
Middlesex	Yes	I,E <sup>b</sup> ,C,S	M	AL	Yes	E	AS	No
New Mexico	Yes	R,E,C	M	AL,AS,CS	Yes	R,E	AS,CL	Yes
Bernalillo	No				No			
Cibola	No				No			

TABLE A. 4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
New York	Yes	C,D,S	M	AL,AS,CL,CS,FL	No			
* Broome								
Cortland	Yes	R,I,E,C	M	AD	No			
Erle	Yes	E,C	M	CL,AL	Yes	E	CL	No
New York City	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CL,AL	Yes	E,D	CL	Yes
* Onondaga								
North Carolina	Yes	E,C,S	M	AL,AS	No			
Craven	Yes	R,C,D	M	AL	No			
Forsyth	Yes	I,E <sup>b</sup> ,C,S	M	FL,AL	No			
Halifax	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CL,AL	Yes	E,D	CL,AL	No
Haywood	No				No			
Yancey	No				No			
*North Dakota								
Cass	No				No			
Emmons	No				Yes	R,E,D	AS	No
Grand Forks	Yes	C	M	AL,AS	Yes	R,E,D	AS	Yes
Mountrail	No				Yes	R,E	AS	Yes
Stutsman	No				No			
Ohio	No				Yes	R,E,D	AS	Yes
Cuyahoga	Yes	E,C,D,S	M	CL,AL	No			
Delaware	Yes	C,S	Q	AS	Yes	E	AL,AS	No
Franklin	Yes	R,I,C,S	M	CL,AL	Yes	R,E,D	CL,AL	No
Mahoning	Yes	E,S	Q	FL,AD,AS	No			
Richland	No				No			

TABLE A.4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
Oklahoma	Yes	R,I,E,C,S	M	CS,FS	No			
Carter	**				No			
Custer	**				No			
Oregon	Yes	R,E,C,D,S	M	AL,AD,CS	Yes	R,E,D	AL,AD,AS,CS	Yes
Albany	No				No			
Cottage Grove	No				No			
East Portland	Yes	R,I	M	AL	No			
Springfield	No				No			
West Eugene	No				No			
Pennsylvania	Yes	R,C	M	CL,CS	No			
Lycoming	Yes	I	M	AL	No			
Philadelphia (Center)	No				No			
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	No				No			
Philadelphia (West)	No				No			
Westmoreland	No				No			
Rhode Island	Yes	R,I <sup>b</sup> ,E,C,D	M	CS	No			
Providence	**				No			
Warwick	**				No			
South Carolina	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	AL,AS	Yes	R,E,D	AL,AS	OK
Darlington	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CL	No			
Georgetown	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CL,AL	Yes	E,D	CL	Yes
Newberry	Yes	R,E,C,D,S	M	CL,AL	Yes	R,E,D	CL,AL	Yes
Orangeburg	No				No			
Richland	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CL,AS	Yes	R,E,D	CL,AL	Yes

TABLE A.4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
South Dakota	Yes	E,C,D,S	M	AL,AD,CD,CS	Yes	R,E	CD,CS	Yes
Bennett	**				No			
Davison	**				No			
Tennessee	No				No			
Davidson	No				No			
Sumner	No				No			
Texas	Yes	R,I,E <sup>b</sup> ,C,D,S	M	AD,AS	Yes	E,D <sup>b</sup>	AS,CD,FS	Yes
* Bexar								
DelWitt	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	Ref.	Yes	R,E,D	AL	No
* Harris								
Smith	No				No			
Tarrant	No				No			
Utah	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	CL,CS	Yes	R,E	CL,CS	Yes
Region 2B	**				No			
Region 7A	**				No			
Vermont	Yes	R,E,C,D,S	M	AL,AS	Yes	R,E,D	AL,AS	No
Hartford	**				Yes	R,E,D	AL	Yes
St. Albans	**				No			
Virginia	Yes	E,C,S	M	AL	Yes	E	AL	Yes
Charlotte	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,I <sup>b</sup> ,E,C,D,S	M	FL,AS,FS,OL <sup>e</sup>	Yes	R,E,D	AL,AS	No
Hampton IC	No				No			
Norfolk IC	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S <sup>b</sup>	M	FL,CL,AS	No			
* Portsmouth								
Pulaski	No				Yes	R,E,D	AL,FL	No

TABLE A.4 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Routine Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.00)	Routine Summary Reports Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q2.01)	Frequency with Which Most of the Summary Reports Are Prepared (Q2.01)	General Distribution of Summary Reports (Q2.01)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared (Q3.14)	Routine Reports on the Status of Individual Cases Prepared, by Stage of Process (Q3.15)	General Distribution of Status Reports (Q3.15)	Production of at Least One Set of Status Reports Is Automated (Q3.15)
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	No				Yes	E,D	CD	Yes
Washington	Yes	I,E,C,S	M	AS,CS,FS	No			
Benton	No				No			
King-Rainier	Yes	R,I,E	M	CS	No			
Pierce	Yes <sup>b</sup>	R,I,E	M	AL,AD,AS	No			
Spokane	No				No			
Vancouver	No				Yes	E	CL	No
West Virginia	Yes	R,I,E,C,D	M	AD,CS	No			
Beckley	**				No			
Charleston	**				No			
Wisconsin	No				No			
Bayfield	No				No			
Douglas	Yes	C,D	M	AL	No			
Milwaukee	Yes	R,I,E	M	CL,AL	Yes	R,E,D	AL	Yes
Rock	Yes	R,I,E,C,D,S	M	AL,CL,OL <sup>d</sup>	Yes	R,E,D	AL,CL	Yes
Sauk	Yes	R,E,C,S	M	CL,AL,AS	Yes	R,E,D	AL,AS	Yes
Wyoming	Yes	E,C	I	AL	Yes	E,D	AL	Yes
Carbon	Yes	R,C,S	M	AL	No			
Crook	No				No			
Freemont	No				No			
Matrona	No				No			
Park	No				Yes	R,E,D	AL	No

TABLE A.4 (continued)

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in the interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. Respondent refused to answer question.

KEYS: Stage of Process for Summary Reports:	Frequency:	Distribution:	Stage of Process for Status Reports:
R = Referral	M = At least monthly	A = Agency	R = Referral
I = Investigation	Q = Quarterly	C = Claims/Collection Unit	E = Establishment
E = Establishment	I = Irregularly	F = Fraud/Investigation Unit	D = Delinquent Claims
C = Collections		O = Other	
D = Delinquent Claims			
S = Suspension/Termination			

For each of the above,  
code whether it is:

L = Local/County  
D = District/Region  
S = State

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>Fraud (or suspected fraud) cases only.

<sup>c</sup>Nonfraud cases only.

<sup>d</sup>Local sheriff's office.

<sup>e</sup>Commonwealth attorney's office.

<sup>f</sup>Burlington Co. (NJ) Welfare Board administrators.

TABLE A.5

STAFF TRAINING, AVAILABILITY OF MANUALS, AND THE USE OF  
TIME LIMITS IN THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS, BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Training in Claims Collection Process (Q2.02)	Extent of Training in Claims Processes and Procedures (Q2.03)	Emphasis of Training (Q2.04)	Written Manual on Claims Process Available to Staff (Q2.05)	Established Time Limits for Processing Claims (Q2.07)	Established Time Limits by Stage of Process (Q2.07)
Alabama	Yes	R,T	R	Yes	No	
Bibb	No			Yes	Yes	R
Etowah	No			Yes	No	
Franklin	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Mobile	Yes	N	I,C,R	Yes	No	
Morgan	Yes	N,T	D	Yes	Yes	I,E,C
Alaska	No			Yes	Yes	R <sup>C</sup> ,E
Anchorage-Muldoon	**					
Ketchikan	**					
Arizona	No			No	Yes	R,I
Maricopa	**					
Navajo	**					
Arkansas	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	Yes	R,I,E <sup>C</sup> ,C <sup>b</sup>
Clay	**					
Phillips	**					
*California						
Los Angeles	Yes	N,T	C	Yes	Yes	E <sup>C</sup> ,C
San Bernardino	Yes	R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
San Joaquin	Yes	N,R,T	P,R	Yes	No	
* Sonoma						
* Yolo						
Colorado	Yes	N,T	D,I	Yes	No	
Boulder	Yes	N,T	C	Yes	Yes	I,E,C
Denver	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Gunnison-Hinsdale	Yes	R	P	Yes	No	
* Mesa						
Pueblo	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Connecticut	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	No	
* New Haven						
* Torrington						
Delaware	Yes	N,T	D,R	Yes	No	
New Castle	**					
Sussex	**					

TABLE A.5 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Training in Claims Collection Process (Q2.02)	Extent of Training in Claims Processes and Procedures (Q2.03)	Emphasis of Training (Q2.04)	Written Manual on Claims Process Available to Staff (Q2.05)	Established Time Limits for Processing Claims (Q2.07)	Established Time Limits by Stage of Process (Q2.07)
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes	N,R,T	D,C,R	Yes	No	
Florida	Yes	N,T	Varies <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	R,I,E <sup>C</sup>
Dade	**					
Polk	**					
Georgia	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	Yes	E
Bibb	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C,R	Yes	Yes	E <sup>C</sup> ,C <sup>C</sup>
Colquitt	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I <sup>C</sup> ,E <sup>C</sup> ,C <sup>C</sup>
Fulton	Yes	R,T	C	Yes	Yes	R,I <sup>C</sup> ,E <sup>C</sup>
Madison	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
* Peach						
Guam <sup>a</sup>	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	Yes	R
Hawaii	Yes	N,R,T	I,R	Yes	No	
Honolulu	**					
Maui	**					
Idaho	Yes	N,T	C	Yes	Yes	E,C
* Ada						
* Bonneville						
* Canyon						
* Owyhee						
* Shoshone						
Illinois	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Cook Co. (Ashland)	Yes	N,R,T	D,I	Yes	Yes	E
Cook Co. (Englewood)	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	I
Cook Co. (Garfield)	Yes	N,R,T	D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	I
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	Yes	N,R,T	C,R	Yes	Yes	R
Greene	Yes	N,R,T	D,C	Yes	Yes	I
Indiana	No			Yes	No	
Adams	Yes	R,T	P,D,C	Yes	Yes	R <sup>C</sup>
Allen	Yes	R	C,R	Yes	No	
Marion	Yes	N,T	D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Scott	Yes	N,T	P,D,I,C	Yes	No	
Wayne	No			Yes	Yes	R,E,C
Iowa	Yes	N,R,T	R	Yes	No	
Iowa	**					
Webster	**					



TABLE A.5 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Training in Claims Collection Process (Q2.02)	Extent of Training in Claims Processes and Procedures (Q2.03)	Emphasis of Training (Q2.04)	Written Manual on Claims Process Available to Staff (Q2.05)	Established Time Limits for Processing Claims (Q2.07)	Established Time Limits by Stage of Process (Q2.07)
Kansas	Yes	T	I	Yes	No	
Cherokee	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C,R	Yes	No	
Franklin	Yes	N,T	P	Yes	Yes	I,E
Linn	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	I,E
Wichita	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Wyandotte	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C,R	Yes	No	
Kentucky	Yes	N,T	P,D	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Bell	Yes	N,R,T	D,I,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Carter	Yes	R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Hart	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Jefferson	Yes	R,T	P,D,I,C	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Todd	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Louisiana	Yes	N,T	R	Yes	Yes	R,E,C
Caddo	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R
Lincoln	No			Yes	Yes	R,I
Orleans	Yes	R,T	P,D,I,C,R	No	Yes	R,I
St. Tammany	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,R	Yes	Yes	R,I
Tangipahoa	No			Yes	Yes	R,I
Maine	Yes	N,R,T	D,C	Yes	No	
Augusta	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Lewiston	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Maryland	Yes	N,R,T	R	Yes	Yes	I,E
Allegany	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Baltimore City	Yes	N,R,T	C,R	Yes	No	
Baltimore County	Yes	N,T	R	Yes	No	
Frederick	Yes	N,T	P,D,I,C	Yes	Yes	C
Montgomery	Yes	N,T	C	Yes	No	
Massachusetts	Yes	N,T	R	No	Yes	<sup>b</sup> <sub>R</sub> , <sup>b</sup> <sub>I</sub> , <sup>b</sup> <sub>E</sub> , C
Malden	Yes	N,T	P,D,C	Yes	Yes	<sup>c</sup> <sub>I</sub>
Roslindale	Yes	N,R,T	C	Yes	No	
Michigan	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	No	
Berrien	No			Yes	No	
Branch	Yes	N,T	P,D,I,C	Yes	No	
Maconb	No			Yes	Yes	E,C
St. Clair	Yes	T	R	Yes	No	
Wayne	Yes	R	P,D,C	Yes	Yes	R,I,E

TABLE A.5 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Training in Claims Collection Process (Q2.02)	Extent of Training in Claims Processes and Procedures (Q2.03)	Emphasis of Training (Q2.04)	Written Manual on Claims Process Available to Staff (Q2.05)	Established Time Limits for Processing Claims (Q2.07)	Established Time Limits by Stage of Process (Q2.07)
Minnesota	Yes	N,R,T	R	Yes	No	
Clay	Yes	N,R,T	P,D	Yes	No	
Dakota	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Hennepin	Yes	N,R,T	O	Yes	No	
Ramsey	Yes	N,T	D,C	Yes	No	
Waseca	Yes	N,R,T	P,D	Yes	No	
Mississippi	Yes	N,R,T	R	Yes	No	
Attala	No			Yes	Yes	R
Hinds	Yes	R,T	I,C	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Louides	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C,R	Yes	Yes	I
Madison	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,R	Yes	Yes	I
Tishomingo	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Missouri	Yes	N,T	D	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Buchanan	Yes	R,T	P,R	Yes	No	
Jackson	Yes	N,T	D	Yes	No	
Lafayette	Yes	N,T	P,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Pettis	Yes	R,T	D	Yes	No	
St. Louis	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Montana	No			Yes	No	
Cascade	No			Yes	No	
Lewis & Clark	Yes	N,R,T	P	Yes	Yes	I
Nebraska	No			Yes	No	
Grand Island	Yes	N,R,T	P,C	Yes	Yes	R
Lexington	No			Yes	No	
Lincoln	Yes	N,R,T	P,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Omaha	Yes	N,T	P,D,C,R	Yes	Yes	C
Seward	No			Yes	Yes	C
Nevada	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Clark	**					
Washoe	**					
New Hampshire	Yes	N,R,T	I,R	Yes	No	
Dover	**					
Keene	**					

TABLE A.5 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Training in Claims Collection Process (Q2.02)	Extent of Training in Claims Processes and Procedures (Q2.03)	Emphasis of Training (Q2.04)	Written Manual on Claims Process Available to Staff (Q2.05)	Established Time Limits for Processing Claims (Q2.07)	Established Time Limits by Stage of Process (Q2.07)
New Jersey	Yes	N,R,T	R	Yes	No	
Burlington	Yes	R,T	R	No	No	
Camden	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Essex	Yes	N,R,T	I	Yes	No	
Hudson	No			Yes	No	
Middlesex	Yes	N,T	I,C,R	Yes	Yes	I
New Mexico	Yes	N,T	D,I	Yes	No	
Bernalillo	Yes	N	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Cibola	No			Yes	Yes	R,E
New York	Yes	N,T	D,R	Yes	No	
* Broome						
Erie	Yes	N,T	D,I,C,R	Yes	No	c
New York City	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C	Yes	Yes	R,E
* Onondaga						
North Carolina	Yes	N,R,T	D,C	Yes	No	
Craven	Yes	N,R,T	D,C,R	Yes	No	
Forsyth	Yes	N,R,T	I	Yes	Yes	I
Halifax	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	Yes	I <sup>c</sup>
Haywood	Yes	R,T	R	Yes	No	
Yancey	Yes	N,R,T	P,D	Yes	No	
*North Dakota						
Cass	Yes	N,R,T	D,C	Yes	No	
Emmons	No			Yes	No	
Grand Forks	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Mountrail	Yes	N,R,T	C,R	Yes	Yes	I,E,C
Stutsman	No			Yes	No	
Ohio	Yes	N,R,T	Varies <sup>d</sup>	Yes	No	
Cuyahoga	Yes	N,R,T	R	Yes	No	
Delaware	No			No	No	
Franklin	Yes	N,R,T	I,C,R	Yes	No	
Mahoning	Yes	N,R,T	I,R	Yes	No	
Richland	Yes	N,R,T	I,C	Yes	No	
Oklahoma	Yes	N,R,T	P,D	Yes	No	
Carter	**					
Custer	**					

TABLE A.5 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Training in Claims Collection Process (Q2.02)	Extent of Training in Claims Processes and Procedures (Q2.03)	Emphasis of Training (Q2.04)	Written Manual on Claims Process Available to Staff (Q2.05)	Established Time Limits for Processing Claims (Q2.07)	Established Time Limits by Stage of Process (Q2.07)
Oregon	Yes	N,T	D,I,C	Yes	Yes	R,I,C
Albany	Yes	R,T	C	Yes	No	
Cottage Grove	Yes	R,T	I,R	Yes	Yes	R,I
East Portland	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I
Springfield	Yes	N,T	P,D,I,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
West Eugene	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C	Yes	No	
Pennsylvania	Yes	N,T	I,R	Yes	No	
Lycoming	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	I
Philadelphia (Center)	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	Yes	N,R,T	C	Yes	Yes	I
Philadelphia (West)	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	I
Westmoreland	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	I
Rhode Island	Yes	N,T	D,R	Yes	No	
Providence	**					
Warwick	**					
South Carolina	Yes	N,R,T	<sup>d</sup> Varies	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Darlington	Yes	R,T	I,C,R	Yes	Yes	E,C
Georgetown	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Newberry	Yes	R,T	P,D,I,C	Yes	No	
Orangeburg	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	I,E,C
Richland	Yes	N,R,T	I,C,R	Yes	No	
South Dakota	Yes	N,R,T	I,C	Yes	Yes	R,E,C
Bennett	**					
Davison	**					
Tennessee	Yes	N,R,T	D	Yes	Yes	I,E,C
Davidson	Yes	N,R,T	D,I,R	Yes	Yes	E,C
Sumner	Yes	N,R,T	D,C,R	Yes	Yes	I,C
Texas	Yes	N,T	<sup>d</sup> Varies	Yes	Yes	<sup>b</sup> E
* Bexar						
Delwitt	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C	Yes	Yes	R,I <sup>c</sup> ,E <sup>c</sup> ,C <sup>c</sup>
* Harris						
Smith	Yes	N	C	Yes	No	
Tarrant	Yes	N,T	P	Yes	Yes	R,C

TABLE A.5 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Training in Claims Collection Process (Q2.02)	Extent of Training in Claims Processes and Procedures (Q2.03)	Emphasis of Training (Q2.04)	Written Manual on Claims Process Available to Staff (Q2.05)	Established Time Limits for Processing Claims (Q2.07)	Established Time Limits by Stage of Process (Q2.07)
Utah	Yes	N,R,T	C,R	No	No	
Region 2B	**					
Region 7A	**					
Vermont	Yes	N,R,T	D,R	Yes	Yes	I,E
Hartford	**					
St. Albans	**					
Virginia	Yes	N,T	Varies <sup>d</sup>	Yes	No	
Charlotte	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Hampton IC	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Norfolk IC	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
* Portsmouth						
Pulaski	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	Yes	N,R,T	C,R	No	No	
Washington	Yes	N,R,T	D,R	Yes	Yes	E,C
Benton	Yes	T	D,C,R	Yes	Yes	I
King-Rainier	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,C,R	Yes	No	
Pierce	Yes	N,R,T	D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Spokane	Yes	N,R,T	C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Vancouver	No			Yes	Yes	R,I,E
West Virginia	Yes	N,R,T	R	Yes	No	
Beckley	**					
Charleston	**					
Wisconsin	No			Yes	No	
Bayfield	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	E
Douglas	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Milwaukee	Yes	N,R,T	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	No	
Rock	Yes	N,T	D,C,R	Yes	No	
Sauk	Yes	N,R,T	P,C,R	Yes	Yes	E
Wyoming	Yes	N,T	P,C	Yes	Yes	I,E
Carbon	Yes	N,T	P,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Crook	Yes	N,T	P,C	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C
Freemont	Yes	R	C	Yes	No	
Matrona	No			Yes	Yes	R,I,E
Park	Yes	N	P,D,I,C,R	Yes	Yes	R,I,E,C

TABLE A.5 (continued)

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This question was not asked in the interviews with local FSA respondents in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

KEYS: Extent of Training: M = Training for new hires  
R = Refresher training  
T = Retraining (as needed)

Emphasis of Training: P = Prevention of overissuances  
D = Detection of overissuances  
I = Investigation methods  
C = Collection methods  
R = Regulations and procedures  
O = Other

Stage of Process: R = Referral  
I = Investigation  
E = Establishment  
C = Collections

<sup>a</sup> The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup> Fraud (or suspected fraud) cases only.

<sup>c</sup> Nonfraud cases only.

<sup>d</sup> The emphasis of the training varies across the state and/or across units.

<sup>e</sup> The emphasis is on calculations.

TABLE A.6

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRACKING SYSTEM USED TO MONITOR INDIVIDUAL CASES IN THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Established Tracking System (Q3.09)	Tracking System Includes the Monitoring of (Q3.10):								Tracking System Is Automated
		Computer Match Hits	Other Apparent Overissuances	Referrals	Investigations	Established Claims	Claims Collections	Suspended Claims	Disqualified Individuals	
Alabama	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Bibb	No									
Etowah	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Franklin	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobile	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Morgan	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Alaska	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Anchorage-Muldoon	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Ketchikan	No									
Arizona	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maricopa	No									
Navajo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Arkansas	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Clay	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Phillips	No									
*California										
Los Angeles	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
San Bernardino	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Partial
San Joaquin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
* Sonoma										
* Yolo										
Colorado	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Boulder	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Denver	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Gunnison-Hinsdale	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
* Mesa										
Pueblo	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial

TABLE A.6 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Established	Tracking System Includes the Monitoring of (Q3.10):								Tracking System Is Automated
	Tracking System (Q3.09)	Computer Match Hits	Other Apparent Overissuances	Referrals	Investigations	Established Claims	Claims Collections	Suspended Claims	Disqualified Individuals	
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
* New Haven										
* Torrington										
Delaware	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
New Castle	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Sussex	No									
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Dade	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Polk	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Georgia	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bibb	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>c</sup>	Yes <sup>c</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Colquitt	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>c</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Fulton	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Madison	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
* Peach										
Guam <sup>a</sup>	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Hawaii	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partial
Honolulu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Maui	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No	Yes	Partial
Idaho	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
* Ada										
* Bonneville										
* Canyon										
* Owyhee										
* Shoshone										



TABLE A.6 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Established	Tracking System Includes the Monitoring of (Q3.10):								
	Tracking	Computer	Other							
	System	Match	Apparent	Referrals	Investigations	Established	Claims	Suspended	Disqualified	Tracking
	(Q3.09)	Hits	Overissuances			Claims	Collections	Claims	Individuals	System Is
Illinois	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cook Co. (Ashland)	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cook Co. (Englewood)	Yes	DK	DK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cook Co. (Garfield)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	DK	Yes	Partial
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Greene	No									
Indiana	Yes	Yes	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	No
Adams	Yes	No	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No	No
Allen	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Marion	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Scott	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Wayne	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Iowa	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partial
Iowa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Webster	No									
Kansas	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cherokee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Franklin	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Linn	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Wichita	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Wyandotte	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Bell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Carter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Hart	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Jefferson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Todd	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial

TABLE A.6 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Established	Tracking System Includes the monitoring of (Q3.10):								
	Tracking	Computer	Other	Referrals	Investigations	Established	Claims	Suspended	Disqualified	Tracking
	System	Match	Apparent			Claims	Collections	Claims	Individuals	System Is
	(Q3.09)	Hits	Overissuances							Automated
Louisiana	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Caddo	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Lincoln	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Partial
Orleans	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
St. Tammany	No									
Tangipahoa	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Maine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Augusta	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Lewiston	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Allegany	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Baltimore City	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Baltimore County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Frederick	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Montgomery	Yes	DK	DK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Malden	No									
Roslindale	No									
Michigan	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No	Partial
Berrien	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Branch	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Macomb	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
St. Clair	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	DK	Yes	Partial
Wayne	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Minnesota	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Clay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Dakota	No									
Hennepin	Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>c</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ramsey	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waseca	No									

TABLE A.6 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Established	Tracking System Includes the Monitoring of (Q3,10):								
	Tracking	Computer	Other						Tracking	
	System	Match	Apparent	Referrals	Investigations	Established	Claims	Suspended	Disqualified	System Is
	(Q3.09)	Hits	Overissuances			Claims	Collections	Claims	Individuals	Automated
Mississippi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Attala	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Hinds	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Louises	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Madison	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Tishomingo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Missouri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Buchanan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Jackson	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
Lafayette	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Pettis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
St. Louis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Montana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Cascade	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Lewis & Clark	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Partial
Nebraska	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Grand Island	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Lexington	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Lincoln	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Omaha	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Seward	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Partial
Nevada	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clark	No									
Washoe	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dover	No									
Keene	No									

TABLE A.6 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Established	Tracking System Includes the Monitoring of (Q3.10):								Tracking System Is Automated
	Tracking System (Q3.09)	Computer Match Hits	Other Apparent Overissuances	Referrals	Investigations	Established Claims	Claims Collections	Suspended Claims	Disqualified Individuals	
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Burlington	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Camden	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Essex	No									
Hudson	No									
Middlesex	No									
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Bernalillo	No									
Cibola	No									
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Partial
* Broome										
Cortland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Erie	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
New York City	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
* Onondaga										
North Carolina	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Craven	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Forsyth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Halifax	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Haywood	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Yancey	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
*North Dakota										
Cass	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Emmons	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Grand Forks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Mountrail	No									
Stutsman	No									

TABLE A.6 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Established	Tracking System Includes the Monitoring of (Q3.10):								
	Tracking	Computer	Other	Referrals	Investigations	Established	Claims	Suspended	Disqualified	Tracking
	System	Match	Apparent			Claims	Collections	Claims	Individuals	System Is
	(Q3.09)	Hits	Overissuances							Automated
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Cuyahoga	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Delaware	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Franklin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Mahoning	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Richland	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partial
Carter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Custer	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Albany	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Cottage Grove	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
East Portland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Springfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
West Eugene	No									
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Lycoming	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Philadelphia (Center)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Partial
Philadelphia (West)	No									
Westmoreland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Providence	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Warwick	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Partial
South Carolina	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Darlington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgetown	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Newberry	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Orangeburg	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Richland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

TABLE A.6 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Established Tracking System (Q3.09)	Tracking System Includes the Monitoring of (Q3.10):								Tracking System Is Automated
		Computer Match Hits	Other Apparent Overissuances	Referrals	Investigations	Established Claims	Claims Collections	Suspended Claims	Disqualified Individuals	
South Dakota	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Bennett	No									
Davison	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tennessee	No									
Davidson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Sumner	No									
Texas	Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
* Bexar										
DeWitt	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
* Harris										
Smith	Yes	Yes	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes
Tarrant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Utah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Region 2B	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Region 7A	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Hartford	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>c</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. Albans	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Virginia	Yes	No	No	No	Yes <sup>b</sup>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Charlotte	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Hampton IC	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norfolk IC	Yes	No	No	Yes <sup>c</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
* Portsmouth										
Pulaski	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes

TABLE A.6 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Established Tracking System (Q3.09)	Tracking System Includes the Monitoring of (Q3.10):								Tracking System Is Automated
		Computer Match Hits	Other Apparent Overissuances	Referrals	Investigations	Established Claims	Claims Collections	Suspended Claims	Disqualified Individuals	
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Benton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
King-Rainier	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pierce	Yes	Yes	No	Yes <sup>C</sup>	Yes <sup>C</sup>	Yes	No	No	Yes	Partial
Spokane	DK									
Vancouver	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
West Virginia	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Beckley	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
Charleston	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Wisconsin	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Bayfield	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Douglas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Milwaukee	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rock	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Sauk	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Wyoming	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Carbon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Crook	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Freemont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Matrona	No									
Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

DK Information was not available at the time of the interview.

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>For nonfraud cases only.

<sup>c</sup>For fraud (or suspected fraud) cases only.

TABLE A. 7

CHARACTERISTICS OF ADDITIONAL METHODS USED TO MONITOR INDIVIDUAL CASES IN THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Alabama	Yes	R,A,D,S	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
Bibb	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	CL	No		
Etowah	Yes	A,C	Yes	No	CL	No		
Franklin	Yes	R,A,S,C	Partial	Yes	CL,AL	Yes	R,D	Yes
Mobile	No					No		
Morgan	Yes	R,A,D,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Alaska	Yes	A,D,S	Yes	Yes	AL,CS	No		
Anchorage-Muldoon	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Ketchikan	Yes	R,A	Yes	No	AL	Yes	R	No
Arizona	No					Yes	D	Yes
Maricopa	Yes	R,A,S	No	Yes	AL	No		
Navajo	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	No	AL	No		
Arkansas	Yes	R	No	Yes	AL	Yes	O,R,I,D,S	Yes
Clay	Yes	C	No	No	AL	No		
Phillips	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
*California								
Los Angeles	Yes	C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
San Bernardino	No					No		
San Joaquin	Yes	R,A,C	No	No	AL,CL	No		
* Sonoma								
* Yolo								



TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Colorado	Yes	A,D	No	Yes	AL	Yes	S	No
Boulder	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Denver	Yes	A,C	No	No	AL	No		
Gunnison-Hinsdale	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,A,S	Yes	No	AL	No		
* Mesa								
Pueblo	Yes	A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL,CL	Yes	S	Yes
Connecticut	No					Yes	D,S	Partial
* New Haven								
* Torrington								
Delaware	Yes	R,A,D	Yes	Yes	AL,CS	No		
New Castle	No					No		
Sussex	Yes	R,A,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	No					Yes	I,D,S <sup>c</sup>	No
Florida	Yes	R,A	No	Yes	AL	Yes	R,I,D	Yes
Dade	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	CL,AL	Yes	R,I,D,S	Yes
Polk	Yes	R,A,D,C	Yes	Yes	CL,AL	Yes	R,I,D	Yes
Georgia	Yes	A,D,S	Yes	Yes	AL	Yes	R,D,S	Yes
Bibb	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,A,S,C	Partial	Yes	CL,AL	Yes	O,D	Yes
Colquitt	Yes	R,A,D,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Fulton	Yes	A,D,C	Yes	No	AL	No		
Madison	Yes	R,A,D,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
* Peach								
Guam <sup>b</sup>	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,A	No	Yes	CS	No		
Hawaii	Yes	A,D	Yes	Yes	AL,FS	No		
Honolulu	Yes	R,A,D,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Maui	Yes	R,A,D,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		

TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Idaho	Yes	R,A,D	Partial	Some	AL	No		
* Ada								
* Bonnaville								
* Canyon								
* Owyhee								
* Shoshone								
Illinois	No					No		
Cook Co. (Ashland)	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Cook Co. (Englewood)	Yes	R	No	Yes	AL	No		
Cook Co. (Garfield)	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Greene	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
Indiana	Yes	A,D	No	Yes	AL	No		
Adams	No					No		
Allen	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL, CL	Yes	D,S	No
Marion	Yes	C	No	Yes	AL, CL	No		
Scott	Yes	R,A,B,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Wayne	Yes	A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	CL	Yes	I	No
Iowa	No					No		
Iowa	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Webster	Yes	R	No	No	AL	No		
Kansas	No					Yes	D,S	Yes
Cherokee	Yes	R,A,D,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Franklin	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL, FD	No		
Linn	Yes	R,A,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Wichita	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Wyandotte	Yes	A,D,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		

TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Kentucky	Yes	R,A,D,S	Partial	Yes	AL,CL	No		
Bell	Yes	R,A,S,O	No	Yes	AL	No		
Carter	Yes	R,A,O	No	No	AL,CL	Yes	O,R,I	No
Hart	Yes	R,A,D,O	No	No	AL	No		
Jefferson	Yes	R,D,S,O	Partial	Yes	AL	Yes	O,R	No
Todd	Yes	R,A,O	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Louisiana	Yes	R,A,D,S	Yes	Yes	CS,FS	Yes	D,S	Partial
Caddo	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,O	No	Yes	AL	No		
Lincoln	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,A	No	Yes	AL	No		
Orleans	No					Yes	R,I	No
St. Tammany	Yes	R,A,D,S,O	No	No	AL	No		
Tangipahoa	Yes	R,O	No	No	AL	Yes	O,R,I	No
Maine	Yes	R <sup>b</sup>	Yes	Yes	AL,CS,FS	No		
Augusta	No					No		
Lewiston	Yes	R,A,D,S,O	Yes	No	AL	No		
Maryland	No					Yes	S	No
Allegany	Yes	R,D,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Baltimore City	Yes	A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	CL	No		
Baltimore County	Yes	R,A,D,C	No	No	CL	Yes	R	Yes
Frederick	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Montgomery	Yes	A	No	Yes	AL	No		
Massachusetts	Yes	A,S	Yes	Yes	AL	Yes	O,R,I,D,S	Partial
Malden	No					No		
Roslindale	No					No		
Michigan	No					No		
Berrien	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Branch	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
Macomb	Yes	R,A,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
St. Clair	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Wayne	Yes	A,D	Yes	Yes	AL,CL,AS	No		

TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Minnesota	Yes	Varies <sup>d</sup>	Yes			No		
Clay	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Dakota	Yes	R,A,D,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Hennepin	Yes	A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL,CL	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,I <sup>b</sup> ,D,S	Yes
Ramsey	No					No		
Waseca	No					No		
Mississippi	Yes	R,A,D	DK	No	AL	No		
Attala	Yes	R,A,D,C	No	No	AL	No		
Hinds	Yes	R,A,S,C	No	Yes	AL,CL	No		
Lowndes	Yes	A,D,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Madison	Yes	A	No	Yes	AL,CL	No		
Tishomingo	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Missouri	Yes	R,A,D,S	Yes	Yes	AL,FD	Yes	O,R,I,D,S	Yes
Buchanan	Yes	R,A,D,S	No	No	AL,CL	Yes	R,I	Partial
Jackson	Yes	R,A,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Lafayette	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	Yes	I	No
Pettis	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
St. Louis	Yes	R,A,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Montana	Yes	R,A,S	No	Yes	AL	No		
Cascade	Yes	R,A,C	No	No	AL,CS	No		
Lewis & Clark	Yes	R,A,S,C	No	Yes	AL,AS	No		
Nebraska	No					Yes	D,S	Partial
Grand Island	Yes	R,A,D,C	Partial	No	AL	No		
Lexington	Yes	A,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Lincoln	Yes	R,A	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Omaha	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL,CL	Yes	R,D,S	Yes
Seward	Yes	R <sup>c</sup> ,A,D	Partial	Yes	AL	Yes	O,D <sup>c</sup> ,S <sup>c</sup>	No

TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Nevada	Yes	A,D,S	Yes	Yes	AL,CL	No		
Clark	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL,CL	Yes	R,S	Partial
Washoe	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	Yes	R,I,D,S	Partial
New Hampshire	Yes	R,A	No	Yes	AL,CS	No		
Dover	Yes	R	No	Yes	AL	Yes	D,R,I	No
Keene	No					No		
New Jersey	Yes	R,A,D,S	No	Yes	CL,FL	No		
Burlington	Yes	R,A,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Camden	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Essex	Yes	R,A,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Hudson	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	Yes	R	No
Middlesex	Yes	R,A,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
New Mexico	No					No		
Bernalillo	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Cibola	No					No		
New York	No					Yes	D,S	No
* Broome								
Cortland	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Erie	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL,CL	No		
New York City	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	CL	No		
* Onondaga								
North Carolina	Yes	A,D	Yes	No	AL,AS	No		
Craven	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL,CL	No		
Forsyth	Yes	R,A	Partial	Yes	AL	Yes	R	No
Halifax	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Haywood	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	CL	No		
Yancey	Yes	R,A,S,C	No	Yes	AL	Yes	S	Yes

TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
<b>*North Dakota</b>								
Cass	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Emmons	Yes	R,A,D,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Grand Forks	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
Mountain	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
Stutsman	No					No		
<b>Ohio</b>	Yes	R,A	No	Yes	AL,CL	Yes	O,R,S	No
Cuyahoga	Yes	A,D,C	No	Yes	CL,FL	No		
Delaware	No					No		
Franklin	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL,CL,AS	No		
Mahoning	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	Yes	S	No
Richland	Yes	R,A,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
<b>Oklahoma</b>	Yes	R,S	No	Yes	AL	No		
Carter	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Custer	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
<b>Oregon</b>	Yes	R,A,D,S	Yes	Yes	AL,AD,AS,CS	Yes	D,S	Yes
Albany	Yes	R,A,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Cottage Grove	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	No	AL	No		
East Portland	Yes	A,C	Yes	No	AL	No		
Springfield	Yes	A	No	Yes	AL	No		
West Eugene	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	No					Yes	R,I,D,S	Yes
Lycoming	Yes	R,A,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Philadelphia (Center)	No					No		
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	Yes	C	No	Yes	AL	Yes	I	Yes
Philadelphia (West)	No					Yes	I	Yes
Westmoreland	No					No		

TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Rhode Island	Yes	A,S	No	Yes	AL,CS,FS	Yes	D,S	Partial
Providence	Yes	R,A,D,C	Partial	No	AL	No		
Warwick	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	DK	No	AL,CS	No		
South Carolina	Yes	R,A,S	No	Yes	AL	Yes	O,R,I,D,S	Yes
Darlington	Yes	R,A,C	No	Yes	AL	Yes	O,R,I,D,S	Partial
Georgetown	No					No		
Newberry	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Orangeburg	No					No		
Richland	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
South Dakota	Yes	R,A,D	Yes	Yes	AL,CD	Yes	R,D,S	Yes
Bennett	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Davison	Yes	A,D,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
Tennessee	No					No		
Davidson	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Sumner	No					No		
Texas	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,A,D	Partial	No	AL,FS	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,I <sup>b</sup> ,D <sup>b</sup>	Yes
* Bexar								
DeWitt	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL,FL	No		
* Harris								
Smith	Yes	R <sup>c</sup> ,D	No	Yes	AL	No		
Tarrant	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Utah	Yes	R <sup>d</sup>	Yes	No	CL	No		
Region 2B	No					No		
Region 7A	No					No		

TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Vermont	Yes	R,A,D,S	Yes	Yes	AL,AS	No		
Hartford	Yes	R <sup>c</sup> ,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL,CS	Yes	O,R,I,D,S	Yes
St. Albans	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Partial	Yes	AL,FS	No		
Virginia	Yes	R,S	Partial	Yes	AL,CL,FL	No		
Charlotte	No					No		
Hampton IC	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL,CL	No		
Norfolk IC	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
* Portsmouth								
Pulaski	No					No		
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,A	No	No	AL	No		
Washington	Yes	R,A	Partial	Yes	AL,CS	No		
Benton	Yes	R,C	No	No	CL	No		
King-Rainier	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	CL	No		
Pierce	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	No	AL	No		
Spokane	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	AL	No		
Vancouver	Yes	R,A,C	Partial	Yes	CL	No		
West Virginia	Yes	R,A,D,S	No	Yes	AL	No		
Beckley	No					Yes	I,D	No
Charleston	Yes	R <sup>b</sup> ,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL,CD	Yes	I	No
Wisconsin	Yes	R,D,S	Partial	No	AL	No		
Bayfield	No					No		
Douglas	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Milwaukee	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		
Rock	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	Yes	Yes	AL,CL	No		
Sauk	Yes	R,A,C	Yes	Yes	AL	No		



TABLE A.7 (continued)

Jurisdiction	System for Signaling Staff That a Case Needs Further Attention Is Used (Q3.11)	System of Flags Used by Status of Claim (Q3.12)	System of Flags Is Automated (Q3.12)	Flags Are Permanently Attached to Case File (Q3.12)	Functional Level of Staff To Be Alerted by Flags (Q3.12)	System for Aging Claims (Q3.16)	System for Aging by Status of Claim (Q3.17)	System for Aging Is Automated (Q3.18)
Wyoming	Yes	A,D,S	No	No	AL	No		
Carbon	No					Yes	O,R	Partial
Crook	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	Yes	AL	No		
Freemont	Yes	R,A,D,S,C	No	No	AL	No		
Natrona	Yes	R,D	Partial	Yes	AL,CS	No		
Park	Yes	R,A,D,C	No	No	AL	No		

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

DK Information was not available at the time of the interview.

KEYS: Status of Claim for Flags: R = Referral  
A = Active Claim  
D = Delinquent Claim  
S = Suspended Claim  
C = Cases with Disqualified Individuals

Functional Level: A = Agency  
C = Claims Unit  
F = Fraud/Investigations Unit

Status of Claim for Aging: O = Apparent Overissuance  
R = Referral  
I = Investigation  
D = Delinquent Claim  
S = Suspended Claim

For each of the above,  
code whether it is:

L = Local/County  
D = District/Region  
S = State

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>The response refers to cases of fraud (or suspected fraud) only.

<sup>c</sup>The response refers to cases of nonfraud only.

<sup>d</sup>The system of flags used varies across the state.

TABLE A.8

## RANKING OF THE MOST EFFECTIVE METHODS USED IN THE DETECTION OF OVERISSUANCES, BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Computer Matching			Duplicate Participation Check	Error-Prone Profiles	Hotline/ Informal		QC Review	Recertification Review	Special Investigation Units	Information from Other Agencies	Information from Recipient	Supervisory Reviews <sup>b</sup>	Other
	Wages	Unearned Income	Resources			Complaints	Internal Audit							
Alabama	1	1				7	8	6	3	9	5	4		
Bibb	1	2		8		9		4	3		5	7		
Etowah	2	8			6	3		5	1	4		7	6	
Franklin	1	1		9	7	5		6	3		8	10	4	
Mobile	2	3		X		5	X	6	1	X	X	X	4	
Morgan	1	3	X	X	X	7	4		2	X	8	5	6	
Alaska	4	5		6	7	8		3	2	1	10	9		
Anchorage-Muldoon	2	1			10	6	9	5	3		8	7	4	
Ketchikan	1	2				7		5	8		4	6	10	3 <sup>d</sup> , 9 <sup>h</sup>
Arizona	2			7		8	4	5	1	6	9	3		
Maricopa	6			8		7	10	3	1	5	9	2	4	
Navajo	X	X		12	5	10	11	4	X	8	9	6	7	
Arkansas	2				X	3	X	X	1	X	X	X		
Clay	6	8				3		7	1		2	4	5	
Phillips	1	6	12	4	10	11		2	3	9	5	8	7	
*California														
Los Angeles	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
San Bernardino	2	6	10	7		9	4	11	1	3	8	5	12	
San Joaquin	1	2	4	9		6		5	3	11	7	8	10	
* Sonoma														
* Yolo														
Colorado	2	3		10		8	7	4	1	5	9	6		
Boulder	2	3		9		5	11	11	6	4	7	1	8	
Denver	1				6	8	5	4		2		3	7	
Gunnison-Hinsdale	7	6		8		4	9	2	1		5	3	10	
* Mesa														
Pueblo	5			7		2		6	3		8	1	4	

TABLE A.8 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Computer Matching			Duplicate Participation Check	Error-Prone Profiles	Hotline/ Informal Complaints	Internal Audit	QC Review	Recertification Review	Special Investigation Units	Information from Other Agencies	Information from Recipient	Supervisory Reviews <sup>b</sup>	Other
	Wages	Unearned Income	Resources											
Connecticut	1		X	X	X	3	X	X	2	X	X			
* New Haven														
* Torrington														
Delaware	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
New Castle	1	7		2	10	4		3	6	5		8	9	
Sussex	1	2	4	6		7	12	10	3	5	8	12	9	
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	1	3	12	10	5	11	8	7	2	4	9	6		
Florida	1	2		10		7	9	5	3	4	8	6		
Dade	1	2			9	5	8	6	3		10	4	7	
Polk	X	X	9	10	8	7	12	11	3	4		5	6	
Georgia	1	3		8		5	10	4	7	2	9	6		
Bibb	1	7		10		6		4	2	3	9	8	5	
Colquitt	1			9	7	5		6	3		8	2	4	
Fulton	1	2		7		6		8	3		9	4	5	
Madison	3			6		5	9	4	X		8	7	X	
* Peach														
Guam <sup>a</sup>				5	X			2	1	3	6	4		
Hawaii	9		8	2		5		1	3	6	7	4		
Honolulu	1	10	2	9		4	13	8	3	11	12	7	6	5 <sup>j</sup>
Mau	2		10	5		8		6	3		9	7	4	1 <sup>k</sup>
Idaho	3			X	X	4		5	2		X	1		
* Ada														
* Bonneville														
* Canyon														
* Owyhee														
* Shoshone														

TABLE A.8 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Computer Matching			Duplicate Participation Check	Error-Prone Profiles	Hotline/ Informal Complaints	Internal Audit	QC Review	Recertification Review	Special Investigation Units	Information from Other Agencies	Information from Recipient	Supervisory Reviews <sup>b</sup>	Other
	Wages	Unearned Income	Resources											
Illinois	2	3		X		X	X	4	1	X	X	5		6 <sup>c</sup>
Cook Co. (Ashland)	1	X	X	3	X	X	X	X	2	X	X	X	X	
Cook Co. (Englewood)	1	2	9	3	13		11	8	5	12	6	7	10	
Cook Co. (Garfield)	1	7		9		2		8	5	6	5	3	10	4 <sup>h</sup>
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	1	2	X	5		4	X	X	3	X	X	X	X	
Greene	1	4		3		5		6	2	7		6		
Indiana	1					4		2		7	5	3		6 <sup>d</sup>
Adams	1	2		5		6		3	4		7	8		
Allen	1	2		8	7	5		9	3		6		4	
Marion	1	2		6	7	8		3	4	9	10	5	11	
Scott	3	2		8		6		7	1		5	4	9	
Wayne	1	9		11		3	X	5	2	4	10	8	X	
Iowa	1			7		2	8	3	6	5	9	4		
Iowa	2	1		6		8		5	7		9	3	4	
Webster	2	1	12	5		8	10	6	4	11	9	7	3	
Kansas	1	5	X	X	X	2	X	4	X	X	X	3		
Cherokee	2	3		5	11	6		4	1	7	8	9	10	
Franklin	1	3		12	10	2	9	6	4	11	8	5	7	
Linn	1	3		11	10	2	9	6	4	12	7	5	8	
Wichita	1	5		11	9	3		7	8	2	10	4	6	
Wyandotte	1	2		X	X	6	3	5	X	4	X	X	X	
Kentucky	1	8		9		11	4	3	2	7	10	5	6	
Bell	2	6		7		3	8	10	5	11	4	1	9	
Carter	1	7	9	12	4	10	8	6	2		11	5	3	
Hart	1	4		9		10	8	2	3	7	11	6	5	
Jefferson	1	5		9		4		7	3	8	10	2	6	
Todd	1	2		11		6	9	5	3	10	7	4	8	

TABLE A.8 (continued)

TABLE A.8 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Computer Matching			Duplicate Participation Check	Error-Prone Profiles	Hotline/ Informal Complaints	Internal Audit	QC Review	Recertification Review	Special Investigation Units	Information from Other Agencies	Information from Recipient	Supervisory Reviews <sup>b</sup>	Other
	Wages	Unearned Income	Resources											
Mississippi	2	6		7		4	8	5	1		9	3		
Attala	1	2		7	10	8	11	6	3		9	4	5	
Hinds	1	5		4		10	3	2	6		7	8	9	
Lowndes	1	5		7	9	4	8	2	3		10	7	6	
Madison	1	2		12	10	9	7	3	4	8	6	11	5	
Tishomingo	1	4	12	8	11	6	9	10	2		7	5	3	
Missouri	4	7	9	5			6	8	3		10	2		1 <sup>e</sup>
Buchanan	3	3	3	3		X	X	2	1		X	X	X	
Jackson	X	X		4		X	X	3	1	2		X	X	
Lafayette	2	3	10	9		7		5	8		4	1	6	
Pettis	1	X	X	X		3		5	2			4	X	
St. Louis	2	2		7		8	6	4	1	5	11	9	10	
Montana	1	2		10	7	6	11	3	4	5	9	8		
Cascade	4	3		9		2		8	7	1	6	5		
Lewis & Clark	2	8		11		3	9	5	6	1	4	7	10	
Nebraska		3		7		4	8	2	1	9	5	6		
Grand Island	1	6				2	8	3	5		9	4	7	
Lexington		X		X	X	4		X	2		X	1	3	
Lincoln		6		7		2		8	1		5	3	4	
Omaha		1			8	4	9	6	3	10	7	2	5	
Seward	4	4		4		4		1	4		3	4	2	
Nevada	1			9		7	4	6	3	2	8	5		
Clark	1					9	6	7	3	8	2	4	5	
Washoe				9	6	5		8	2		4	1	3	7 <sup>f</sup>
New Hampshire	1					6		3	2	4		5		
Dover	3	4		10		6		5	9	1	7	8	2	
Keene	1	8				3	7	5	2	6	10	9	4	

TABLE A.8 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Computer Matching			Duplicate Participation Check	Error-Prone Profiles	Hotline/ Informal Complaints	Internal Audit	QC Review	Recertification Review	Special Investigation Units	Information from Other Agencies	Information from Recipient	Supervisory Reviews <sup>b</sup>	Other
	Wages Income	Unearned Income	Resources											
New Jersey	1	3		10		7	5	9	2	6	8	4		
Burlington	1	1		7		6		4	2	5	8		3	
Camden	1	2		10		7		5	3	6	9	8	4	
Essex	1	2	X	X	X	X	X	X	3	4	X	X	X	
Hudson	1	2	X	X	6	X	3	5	4	X	X	X		
Middlesex	1	2		8		5		10	3	4	9	6	7	
New Mexico	1	8	10	7	6	12	4	2	11	5	3		9 <sup>d</sup>	
Bernalillo	4	5	2	X	X	X	X	X	6	X	X	1	1	3 <sup>f</sup>
Cibola	1	2	11	13	7	3	10	6	3	12	9	4	8	
New York	4	X	X	2	7	6	5	8	1	3	9	10		
* Broome														
Cortland	5	6		8		3			4	1		2	7	
Erie	1	6	7	11		2	10	12	3	5	9	4	5	
New York City	1	2	X	X	3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
* Onondaga														
North Carolina	5		1	X		1		X	X	X	1	1		
Craven	X	X	X	X		X		7	X	X	8	6		
Forsyth	1	2	4	6		5	7	5	3	7	7			
Halifax	2	1	4	X		7		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Haywood	8	1	9	10		3	11	6	7	2	5	4		
Yancey	1	X	X	X	X	3	X	4	X		X	5	2	
*North Dakota														
Cass	1	9				4	5	3	2	6	7	8	10	
Emmons	2	11		10	9	4	8	5	1		7	6	3	
Grand Forks	3	5		9	10	2	6	7	8		4	1	11	
Mountrail	7	4						5	6		3	2	1	
Stutsman	1	2						4	3		5	6		

TABLE A.8 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Computer Matching			Duplicate Participation Check	Error-Prone Profiles	Hotline/ Informal Complaints	Internal Audit	QC Review	Recertification Review	Special Investigation Units	Information from Other Agencies	Information from Recipient	Supervisory Reviews <sup>b</sup>	Other
	Wages	Unearned Income	Resources											
Ohio	2			4		7		6	1	5		3		
Cuyahoga	1	2	X	4	X	5	X	X	2	X	X	6	7	
Delaware	6	7		8		5	9	2	1		4	3		
Franklin	3	3	9	10		7	11	5	1	6	8	2		
Mahoning						2		3	1	X	X	X	X	
Richland				8		4		7	2	3	5	1	6	
Oklahoma	3	7		4	1	11	6	2	8	5	9	10		
Carter	5	6	13	3	11	2	12	7	4	10	8	1	9	
Custer	5	8		10	4	6	2	11	1	12	7	3	9	
Oregon	1	2		9		6	10	7	5	4	3	8		
Albany	1	6		11		7	10	3	2	5	8	9	4	
Cottage Grove	1	4		7		8	6	3	2	5	9	10	11	
East Portland	1	2	11	12		4	10	8	3	7	5	6	9	
Springfield	2	3		X	X	X	X	X	1	X	X	X	4	5 <sup>k</sup>
West Eugene	2	8	13	10		6	12	7	1	11	3	5	4	
Pennsylvania	3			X	X	X	2	1	X		X	X		
Lycoming	1	1	1	10		9		6	5	8		7	4	
Philadelphia (Center)	1	5		X			3	2	4	X	X	X	X	
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	1	3		8		8	2	5	4	6	8	8	7	
Philadelphia (West)	1	7		8		9	3	10	2	4	11	6	5	8 <sup>l</sup>
Westmoreland	1	2		4		8	11	9	3	5	10	6	7	
Rhode Island	3	4		6		9	11	7	1	10	1	8	5	
Providence	2	8		3	6	11	7	1	9		5	10	4	
Warwick	3	2	5	6		7		4	1	11	8	9	10	
South Carolina	1			X		X	X	X	2	X	X	3		
Darlington	2	3		9		6		7	1	8	10	4	5	
Georgetown	5	6				8	10	9	1	4	2	3	7	
Newberry	1	3			4	6	11	8	2	7	10	5	9	
Orangeburg	3	9	5	11		6	10	4	1	2	7	8	12	
Richland	2	9	10	11	X	X	X	4	1	3	X	5	6	

A-77



TABLE A.8 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Computer Matching			Duplicate Participation Check	Error-Prone Profiles	Hotline/ Informal Complaints	Internal Audit	QC Review	Recertification Review	Special Investigation Units	Information from Other Agencies	Information from Recipient	Supervisory Reviews <sup>b</sup>	Other
	Wages	Unearned Income	Resources											
South Dakota	1	3		9	10	8	7	5	6	11	4	2		
Bennett	2	3		7	7	10		5	4		7	6	1	
Davison	1	8		9		6	10	4	5		7	2	3	
Tennessee	1	X		X	X	X	X	2	3	X	X	X		
Davidson	1	6		5		4	9	3	2	10	11	8	7	
Sumner	1	2		9		8		6	3	10	7	4	5	
Texas	1	9		4		6	8	5	2		7	3		
* Bexar														
DeWitt	1	2		3		X	5	4	X	X	X	X	X	
* Harris														
Smith	2	3		10		11	6	5	1		8	7	4	
Tarrant	3	4		5		7	9	8	2	11	10	1	6	
Utah	3			8	4	1	6	10	7	2	9	5		
Region 2B	6	7	10	11	8	3	4	5	1	2	12	13	9	
Region 7A	2	5		12	11	8	3	9	1	7	6	10	4	
Vermont	X	X	X			X	2	3	1		X	4		
Hartford	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	4	2	X	X	1	3	
St. Albans	6	1		4	3	5	11	10	2		7	8	9	
Virginia	7			4		11	10	1	6	8	9	5	3	2 <sup>d</sup>
Charlotte	1	7			9	2	8	3	5		6	4	10	
Hampton IC	1	6		10		2		9	5	7	8	4	3	
Norfolk IC	1	2		9		3		4	6	8	5	7	10	
* Portsmouth														
Pulaski	2	6	7			1		4	5	10	8	3	9	
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>				5	3			2	1			4		

TABLE A. 8 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Computer Matching			Duplicate Participation Check	Error-Prone Profiles	Hotline/ Informal Complaints	Internal Audit	QC Review	Recertification Review	Special Investigation Units	Information from Other Agencies	Information from Recipient	Supervisory Reviews <sup>b</sup>	Other
	Wages	Unearned Income	Resources											
Washington	1	3		8		7	2	5	6	9	4	10		
Benton	1	2		11		4	8	3	10	9	6	5	7	
King-Rainier	1	2		3		8	4	5	6	7	11	9	10	
Pierce	1	5		X		4	X	X	X	X	3	2	X	
Spokane	1	2		4		X	X	3	X	X	X	X	X	
Vancouver	1	2		5		3		8	6	7	9	4		
West Virginia	1	1	1	10	8	7		5	1	9		6		
Beckley	8	5		6		9		4	2		10	7	3	1 <sup>d</sup>
Charleston	1	1		9	10	5	12	8	3	11	6	7	4	
Wisconsin		2		X		X	X	1	X	3	X	X		
Bayfield		1		X	X	4	X	X	X		X	X	5	
Douglas		3			5	2	4	9	1		7	6	8	
Milwaukee	2	1		5	7	12	8	3	6	4	11	10	9	
Rock		2		6		5	3	4	7	9	8	1	10	
Sauk	11	1		6	10	7	2	5	4	12	9	8	3	
Wyoming	1	3				6	7	4			5	2		
Carbon	2	3		6		9	7	4	5		10	8	1	
Crook	3	9		11	4	10	2	7	6	12	5	1	8	
Freemont	1	2		9	11	10	6	4	3		7	8	5	
Natrona	1	2		5		3		4						
Park	1	2		11	4	10	3	6	9		7	8	5	

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

NOTE: This table is based upon Q4.00 in the census and survey instruments.

KEY: 1-13 = Rank order of effectiveness

X = Method is used, but was not ranked.

TABLE A.8 (continued)

- <sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.
- <sup>b</sup>"Supervisory review" was not included in the census instrument but was listed by respondents as an "other" often enough to warrant inclusion as a separate methodological category in the survey instruments.
- <sup>c</sup>Computer match with credit bureau files.
- <sup>d</sup>Special case reviews.
- <sup>e</sup>Day-to-day activities of the caseworker.
- <sup>f</sup>Manual bank match.
- <sup>g</sup>Reference checks (landlord, neighbors).
- <sup>h</sup>Random home visits.
- <sup>i</sup>Employment program.
- <sup>j</sup>Peer review.
- <sup>k</sup>Monthly reporting.
- <sup>l</sup>External audits.

TABLE A.9

THE ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE OF THE INVESTIGATION STAGE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS.  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Suspected		Suspected		Suspected			
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Alabama	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Bibb	AL	AL	6	6	No	No	Yes	No difference
Etowah	AL	AL	6	6	No	No	No	No difference
Franklin	CL	CL	12	12	No	No	Yes	Fraud
Mobile	CL	CL	6	6	No	No	No	Fraud
Morgan	AL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Alaska	FS	AL	6	1	Yes	No	Yes	No difference
Anchorage-Muldoon	**							
Ketchikan	**							
Arizona	FS	AL	DK	DK	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Maricopa	**							
Navajo	**							
Arkansas	AL	AL	3,5 <sup>C</sup>	3	Yes	No	No	Fraud
Clay	**							
Phillips	**							
*California								
Los Angeles	FL,AL	AL	DE	1	DK	DK	No	No difference
San Bernardino	AL,CL,FL	AL,CL	6	1	Yes	No	Yes	No difference
San Joaquin	AL,CL,FL	AL,CL	6	1	Yes	No	Yes	No difference
* Sonoma								
* Yolo								

TABLE A.9 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Suspected		Suspected		Suspected			
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Colorado	FL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud
Boulder	AL,CL	AL,CL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Denver	AL,FL	AL,FL	NG	NG	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Gunnison-Hinsdale	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
* Mesa								
Pueblo	AL,FL	AL,FL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Connecticut	FS	CL,CS	Varies	Varies	No	No	No	Fraud
* New Haven								
* Torrington								
Delaware	FS	AL	5	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
New Castle	**							
Sussex	**							
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	FS	CS	3	3	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Florida	FD	CD	6	1,2,5 <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud
Dade	**							
Polk	**							
Georgia	AL,FS	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Bibb	AL	AL	4	RD	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Colquitt	AL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Fulton	FD	AL,CL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Madison	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
* Peach								
Guam <sup>a</sup>	CS,FS	CS,FS	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud

TABLE A.9 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Suspected		Suspected		Suspected			
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Hawaii	AL,FS	AL	6	6	No	No	No	Fraud
Honolulu	**							
Mau	**							
Idaho	AL,FS	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
* Ada								
* Bonneville								
* Canyon								
* Owyhee								
* Shoshone								
Illinois	AL,CS,FS	AL,FS	Varies	6	No	No	No	No difference
Cook Co. (Ashland)	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Cook Co. (Englewood)	FS	AL,FL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Cook Co. (Garfield)	AL,FL,FS	AL,FL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	AL	AL	DE	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Greene	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Indiana	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Adams	NA <sup>e</sup>	AL	NA	6	NA	Yes	NA	NA
Allen	CL	CL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Marion	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Scott	AL	AL	NG	NG	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Wayne	AL,CL	AL,CL	6	2	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Iowa	FS	AL	Varies	Varies	No	No	No	Fraud
Iowa	**							
Webster	**							

TABLE A.9 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Suspected		Suspected		Suspected			
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Kansas	AL,FD	AL	3	3	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Cherokee	AL,FD	AL	3	3	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Franklin	AL	AL	3	3	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Linn	AL,FD	AL	3	3	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Wichita	AL,FL	AL,FL	3	3	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Wyandotte	AL,FL	AL,FL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Kentucky	AL,CL,FS	AL,CL	6	2	Yes	No	No	No difference
Bell	AL,FS	AL	6	2	Yes	Yes	No	Nonfraud
Carter	AL	AL	6	2	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Hart	AL,FS	AL	2	2	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Jefferson	AL,FS	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Todd	AL,FS	AL	DE	2	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Louisiana	FD	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Caddo	AL	AL	5	5	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Lincoln	AL	AL	6	6	No	No	No	No difference
Orleans	FL	FL	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
St. Tammany	AL	AL	NG	NG	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Tangipahoa	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Maine	AL,FS	AL	Varies	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nonfraud
Augusta	AL	AL	NG	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Lewiston	AL	AL	DE	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Maryland	AL,FS	AL,FS	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Allegany	AL	AL	DE	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Baltimore City	AL,CL,FS	AL,CL	NG	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Baltimore County	CL	CL	DE	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Frederick	AL	AL	DE	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Montgomery	CL,FS	CL	NG	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference

TABLE A.9 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Suspected		Suspected		Suspected		(Q5.01)	(Q5.03)
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Massachusetts	CS,FS	AL	6	1	No	No	Yes	No difference
Malden	FS,CS	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	DK	No difference
Rosindale	FS,CS	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Michigan	AL,FL,FS	AL,CL	6	1	No	No	Yes	No difference
Berrien	CL,FS	CL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Branch	AL,FL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Macomb	CL,FL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nonfraud
St. Clair	CL,FL	CL	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Wayne	AL,CL,FS	AL,CL	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Minnesota	AL,FL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Clay	FL	AL,FL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Dakota	AL,LL	AL	DE	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Hennepin	FL	AL	DE	NA <sup>f</sup> ,DE <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Ramsey	AL,FL,CL	AL,CL	NG	1	No	Yes	No	No difference
Waseca	AL,FL,LL	AL,LL	1	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nonfraud
Mississippi	AL,CS	AL,CS	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud
Attala	AL	AL	RD	RD	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Hinds	AL	AL	3	3	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Lowndes	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Madison	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Tishomingo	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Missouri	FD	FD	5, <sup>7c</sup>	NG	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Buchanan	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Jackson	AL	AL	6	NG	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Lafayette	AL	AL	RD	RD	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Pettis	AL	AL	7	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
St. Louis	AL,CL	AL,CL	6	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud



TABLE A.9 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Montana	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	Nonfraud
Cascade	AL,FL	AL,FL	NG	NG	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Lewis & Clark	FL	FL	NG	DE	Yes	Yes	No	Nonfraud
Nebraska	FS	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nonfraud
Grand Island	AL	AL	6	1	No	No	No	No difference
Lexington	AL,FS	AL	5	5	No	No	No	No difference
Lincoln	AL	AL	6	1	No	No	No	No difference
Omaha	AL,FL	AL,CL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nonfraud
Seward	AL	AL	2	2	No	No	No	Nonfraud
Nevada	CL,FL	CL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Clark	**							
Washoe	**							
New Hampshire	FS	CS	6	1	Yes	No	Yes	No difference
Dover	**							
Keene	**							
New Jersey	FL	CL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	Nonfraud
Burlington	FL	FL	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Camden	AL,FL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Essex	CL	CL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Hudson	CL	CL	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Middlesex	AL,CL,FL	AL,CL	5	NG	Yes	No	No	No difference
New Mexico	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Bernalillo	AL	AL	4	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Cibola	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference

TABLE A.9 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Suspected		Suspected		Suspected			
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
New York	AL,FL	AL,FL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
* Broome								
Cortland	CL	AL,CL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Erie	AL,CL,FL	AL,CL	3	3	Yes	No	No	No difference
New York City	CL,FL	CL,FL	6	12	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
* Onondaga								
North Carolina	AL,FL	AL,CL	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Craven	CL	CL	RD	RD	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Forsyth	CL	CL	6	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Halifax	CL	AL	6	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud
Haywood	CL	AL,CL	5	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Yancey	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nonfraud
*North Dakota								
Cass	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Emmons	AL	AL	6	1	No	No	Yes	No difference
Grand Forks	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Mountain	AL	AL	1	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Stutsman	AL	AL	1	1	No	No	No	No difference
Ohio	CL	AL	6	1	Yes	No	No	Fraud
Cuyahoga	FL	AL,CL	DE	6	Yes	No	Yes	Fraud
Delaware	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	Nonfraud
Franklin	AL,CL	AL,CL	7	7,1 <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Mahoning	FL	FL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Richland	FL	AL	DE	1	Yes	Yes	No	Nonfraud
Oklahoma	AL,FS	AL	Varies	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Carter	**							
Custer	**							

TABLE A.9 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Suspected		Suspected		Suspected		(Q5.01)	(Q5.03)
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Oregon	CD,CS	AL,CS	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud
Albany	AL,CS	AL,CS	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Cottage Grove	AL,CS	AL,CS	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
East Portland	AL,CS	AL,CS	6	3	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Springfield	AL,CS	AL,CS	NG	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
West Eugene	AL,CS	AL,CS	6	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Pennsylvania	CL	CL	DK	DK	Yes	No	No	Fraud
Lycoming	AL	AL	4	4	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Philadelphia (Center)	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Philadelphia (West)	AL	AL	1	1	No	No	Yes	No difference
Westmoreland	AL	AL	6	6	No	No	No	No difference
Rhode Island	AL,CS	AL,CS	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Providence	**							
Warwick	**							
South Carolina	CL	CL	6	1,6 <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Darlington	CL	CL	6	1,6 <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Georgetown	CL	CL	6	1,RD <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Newberry	CL	CL	6	RD	No	No	No	Fraud
Orangeburg	CL	CL	5	5	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Richland	CL	CL	6	1,6 <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
South Dakota	AL,CL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Bennett	**							
Davison	**							
Tennessee	FL	AL	6	1	Yes	No	Yes	No difference
Davidson	CL,FL	CL	6	1	Yes	No	No	No difference
Sumner	AL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud

TABLE A.9 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations (Q5.05)		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) (Q5.09)		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations (Q5.10)		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation (Q5.01)	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts (Q5.03)
	Suspected		Suspected		Suspected		Investigation	Efforts
	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
Texas	FL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
* Bexar								
DeWitt	FL	AL	DK	DK	Yes	Yes	Ref.	No difference
* Harris								
Smith	FS	AL	3	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Tarrant	AL,FD	AL,CD	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Utah	AL,CL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Region 2B	**							
Region 7A	**							
Vermont	FS	AL	3	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Hartford	**							
St. Albans	**							
Virginia	CL,FL	AL	6	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Charlotte	FL	AL	5	DE	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Hampton IC	CL	CL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Norfolk IC	FL	AL,CL	7	DE	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
* Portsmouth								
Pulaski	FL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	FS,LS	CD	Varies	Varies	No	No	Yes	Fraud
Washington	FS	CL	6	2	No	No	Yes	No difference
Benton	CL	CL	6	NG	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
King-Rainier	AL,CL	AL,CL	NG	2	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud
Pierce	AL,FL	AL	NG	2	Yes	No	No	No difference
Spokane	CL	CL	2	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Vancouver	CL	CL	6	2	Yes	Yes	No	No difference

TABLE A.9 (continued)

	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Investigations <u>(Q5.05)</u>		Time Period over Which Overissuance Is Calculated (Years) <u>(Q5.09)</u>		Investigation Includes Search for Additional Errors and/or Program Violations <u>(Q5.10)</u>		Referral for Fraud Investigation Made Prior to Any Investigation <u>(Q5.01)</u>	Relative Emphasis on Fraud and Nonfraud Cases in Investigation and Establishment Efforts <u>(Q5.03)</u>
Jurisdiction	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud	Nonfraud		
West Virginia	CS,FS	CS	Varies	Varies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fraud
Beckley	**							
Charleston	**							
Wisconsin	FL <sup>b</sup> ,LL	AL	1	1	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Bayfield	AL	AL	1	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Douglas	AL,FL	AL	6	DE,6 <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Milwaukee	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Rock	AL	AL,FL	DE	1	No	No	No	Nonfraud
Sauk	LL	AL	1	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nonfraud
Wyoming	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Carbon	AL	AL	2	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	No difference
Crook	AL	AL	6	6	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Freemont	AL	AL	DE	DE	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Matrona	AL	AL	2	2	Yes	Yes	No	No difference
Park	AL	AL	DE	1	Yes	Yes	No	Fraud

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in the interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSP system.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. Respondent refused to answer question.

TABLE A.9 (continued)

KEYS: Functional Level: A = Agency  
 C = Claims/Collections Unit  
 F = Fraud/Investigation Unit  
 L = Legal Authority

Time Period: DE = Date of error  
 NG = No established guidelines  
 RD = March 1979

For each of the above,  
 code whether it is:

L = Local/County  
 D = District/Region  
 S = State

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>This refers to a fraud investigator within the office, rather than a specialized fraud unit.

<sup>c</sup>The first figure refers to suspected fraud pursued through criminal proceedings, the second to suspected fraud pursued through administrative disqualification hearings.

<sup>d</sup>The first figure refers to overissuances due to agency error, the second to overissuances due to household error.

<sup>e</sup>A case of suspected fraud has never been pursued in this local FSA.

<sup>f</sup>Cases due to agency error are not pursued.

TABLE A.10

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INVESTIGATION STAGE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not Always Used	Always Used	Not Always Used				
Alabama	C, I, T	H	C, I, T	H	No	No		
Bibb	C, I	T	C	I, P, T	No	No		
Etowah	C	I, H, T	C	I, P, T	No	No		
Franklin	C	I, P, T, W <sup>b</sup>	C	I, P, T	Yes	Yes	A, D, Q, R, W <sup>b</sup>	E, D
Mobile	C	I, P, T, W <sup>b</sup>	C	I, P, T	Yes	Yes	H, P, D, Q, R, W <sup>b</sup>	D
Morgan	C	I, P, T	C	I, P, T	Yes	Yes	A, D, R	N, A, D
Alaska	C, H, T	I, F	C	I, H, T	Yes	No	H, P, N, D, Q, R	
Anchorage-Muldoon	**							
Ketchikan	**							
Arizona	C, T	I, F	C	I, H, T	Yes	No	N, D, Q, R	
Maricopa	**							
Navajo	**							
Arkansas	C	I, H, T, F	C	I, H, T, O <sup>c</sup>	Yes	No	D, Q, R	
Clay	**							
Phillips	**							
*California								
Los Angeles	C, P, I, T, F	H	C	P, I, T	Yes	No	A, D, Q, R, W <sup>b</sup>	
San Bernardino	C, T, W	P, I, H	C, T	P, I, H	No	No		
San Joaquin	C	T, W <sup>b</sup> , P, I, H	C	T, P, I, H	No	No		
* Sonoma								
* Yolo								

TABLE A. 10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always	Not	Always	Not				
	Used	Used	Used	Used				
Colorado	C,T	I,H,F	C	I,H,T	Yes	Yes	N,A,D,Q,R	E,N,A,D
Boulder	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	Yes	H,D,Q,R	D
Denver	C	I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	I,H,T	No	No		
Gunnison-Hinsdale	C,T	P,I,H	C,T	P,I,H	No	No		
* Mesa								
Pueblo	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	Yes	N,A,D,Q,R,H <sup>b</sup>	E,N,A,D
Connecticut	C,T		C	I,H,T	No	No		
New Haven	**							
Torrington	**							
Delaware	C	I,H,T	C	I,H,T	Yes	Yes	D,Q,R	D
New Castle	**							
Sussex	**							
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	C	I,H,T,F	C,I	H,T	Yes	Yes	P,N,D,Q,R	N
Florida	C,T	H,F	C	T	Yes	Yes	H,D,Q,R	E,N,A,D
Dade	**							
Polk	**							
Georgia	C,I	H,T,F	C	I,T	Yes	No	A,D,Q,R	
Bibb	C		C,I	P,H,T	Yes	No	A,D	
Colquitt	NA <sup>n</sup>		C	P,I,H,T	NA	No		
Fulton	NA <sup>n</sup>		C	P,I,T	NA	Yes		N,A,D
Madison	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	No	No		
* Peach								
Guam <sup>a</sup>	C,O <sup>c</sup>	I,H,T,F	C,O <sup>c</sup>	I,H,T	No	No		



TABLE A.10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not Always Used	Always Used	Not Always Used				
Hawaii	C, I, T	H, F	C	I, H, T	Yes	No	A, D, Q, R	
Honolulu	**							
Maui	**							
Idaho	C	I, H, T, F	C	I, H, T	No	Yes		E, N, A, D
* Ada								
* Bonneville								
* Canyon								
* Owyhee								
* Shoshone								
Illinois	C	I, H, T	C	I, H, T	Yes	No	H, P, N, A, D, Q, R	
Cook Co. (Ashland)	C	P, I, H, T, W <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, H, T	No	No		
Cook Co. (Englewood)	C	P, I, H, T, W <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, H, T	Yes	Yes	P, N, A, Q, R, W <sup>b</sup>	P, E, N, A, D
Cook Co. (Garfield)	C	P, I, H, T	C	P, I, H, T	No	No		
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	C, T	P, I, H, W <sup>b</sup>	C, T	P, I, H	No	No		
Greene	C	P, I, T, W <sup>b</sup>		C, P, I, T	No	No		
Indiana	C, T	I, F, Q <sup>d</sup>	C, T	I	No	No		
Adams	NA <sup>o</sup>		C	P, I, T	No	No		
Allen	C, T	P, I, H, W <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, H, T	No	No		
Harrison	C	T	C	T	Yes	Yes	A, D	O
Scott	C	P, I, T, W <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, T	No	Yes		A
Wayne	C	P, I, H, T, W <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, H, T	Yes	Yes	N, A, D, Q, R	H, N, A, D
Iowa	C, T	I, H, F	C	I, H, T	No	No		
Iowa	**							
Webster	**							

TABLE A.10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not Always Used	Always Used	Not Always Used				
Kansas	C,T	I,H,F	C	T	Yes	No	N,D,Q,R	
Cherokee	C,T	P,I,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I	Yes	No	P,N,A,D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	
Franklin	C,T	P,I,H,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I,H	No	No		
Linn	C,T	P,I,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I	No	No		
Wichita	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Wyandotte	C,I,T	H,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I,H	Yes	No	H,P,N,A,D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	
Kentucky	C,I,T		C,I	T	No	No		
Bell	C	P,I,T,W,O <sup>j</sup>	C	P,I,T,O <sup>j</sup>	No	No		
Carter	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Hart	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Jefferson	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	Yes	Yes	D	D
Todd	C,T	P,I	C,T	P,I	No	No		
Louisiana	C,I	H,T,F	C	I,T	No	No		
Caddo	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Lincoln	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Orleans	C,T	P,I	C,T	P,I	No	No		
St. Tammany	C	P,I,H,T	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	Yes	A,D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	P,E,N,A,D
Tangipahoa	C	P,I,H,T	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Maine	C	I,H,T	C	I,H,T	No	No		
Augusta	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Lewiston	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	Yes	Yes	Q,R	H,N,A,D
Maryland	C,T	I,H	C,T		Yes	Yes	N,D,Q,R	N,A,D
Allegany	C	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	DK	No		
Baltimore City	C,T,W <sup>b</sup>	P,I,H	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Baltimore County	C	T,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T,O <sup>m</sup>	P,I	Yes	Yes	D,O	E,D,O
Frederick	C,O <sup>m</sup>	I,T	C,O <sup>m</sup>	I,T	No	No		
Montgomery	C,T	P	T	C,P	Yes	No	A	

TABLE A.10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not Always Used	Always Used	Not Always Used				
Massachusetts	C	T	C		Yes	No	D,Q,R	
Malden	DK	DK	C	I	DK	No		
Roslindale	NA <sup>n</sup>	NA	C	P,I,H,T	NA	No		
Michigan	C	I,H,T,F	C	I,T	Yes	No	D,Q,R	
Berrien	C,I	T,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	I	Yes	No	D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	
Branch	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Macomb	C,I,T	P,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	No	N,A,D,Q,R	
St. Clair	C,T	P,I,H,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I	No	No		
Wayne	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Minnesota	C,T	I,H,F	C,I	H,T	Yes	Yes	N,A,D,Q,R	N,A,D
Clay	T,W <sup>b</sup>	C,I,H	C	P,I,T	Yes	No	H,N,A,D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	
Dakota	C,P	I,H,T	C,P	I,T	Yes	Yes	R,N,D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	A
Hennepin	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T,O <sup>m</sup>	Yes	Yes	N,A,D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	N,A,D
Ramsey	C,T	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	Yes	Yes	H,P,N,A,D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	E,A,D
Waseca	C	P,I	C	P,I,H	No	No		
Mississippi	C	I,H,T,F	C	I,H,T,O <sup>d</sup>	No	No		
Attala	C	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Hinds	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	Yes	No	D	
Lowndes	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Madison	C	P,I,T	C	P,T	No	No		
Tishomingo	C	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Missouri	C,T	I,H,F	C,T	I	Yes	Yes	N,D,Q	D
Buchanan	C	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	Yes	Yes	N,D,R,W <sup>b</sup>	E,A
Jackson	C	P,T	C	P,T	No	No		
Lafayette	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Pettis	C,T	P,I,H,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I,H	No	No		
St. Louis	C	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	No	No		

TABLE A. 10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not Always Used	Always Used	Not Always Used				
Montana	C,T	I,H,F	C	I,H,T	Yes	Yes	P,A,D,Q,R	H,P,N,A,D
Cascade	C	P,I,H,T	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	Yes	P,N,A,D,Q,R,M <sup>b</sup>	P,E,N,A,D
Lewis & Clark	C,T	P,I,H	C,T	P,I,H	No	Yes		A,D
Nebraska	C	I,H,T	C	I,H,T	Yes	No	N,D,Q,R	
Grand Island	C,T	W <sup>b</sup>	C	H,I,T	No	No		
Lexington	C	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Lincoln	C	H,I,T	C	H,I,T	No	No		
Omaha	C	H,I,T	C	H,I,T	Yes	Yes	D,R	N,D
Seward	C,T,W <sup>b</sup>	P,I,H	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	Yes	H,P,N,A,D,Q,R,M <sup>b</sup>	H,E,N,D
Nevada	C,T	I,H,F	C,T	I,H	Yes	Yes	N,A,D,Q,R	N,A,D
Clark	**							
Washoe	**							
New Hampshire	C,T	I,H,F	C		Yes	No	P,N,A,D,Q,R	
Dover	**							
Keene	**							
New Jersey	C,I	H,T,F	C	I,H,T	Yes	Yes	N,A,D,Q,R	E,N,A,D
Burlington	C	H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	T	No	Yes		A
Camden	C,T	P,I,H,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I,H	No	Yes		N,A
Essex	C,T	P,I	C,T	P,I	Yes	Yes	N,D	N,D
Hudson	C,T	P,I,H,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I,H	No	Yes		A
Middlesex	C,T	P,I,H,W <sup>b</sup>	C	T	Yes	Yes	P,N,A,D,Q,R,M <sup>b</sup>	0
New Mexico	C,I	H,T,F	C,I	H,T	No	No		
Bernalillo	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Cibola	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		

TABLE A.10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not	Always Used	Not				
		Always Used		Always Used				
New York	C,T	I,H,F	C,I	H,T	No	No		
* Broome								
Cortland		C,P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	No	N,D,R	
Erie	C	I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	I,H	Yes	No	P,N,A,D,Q,R	
New York City	C	I,T	C		No	No		
* Chondaga								
North Carolina	C	I,H,T,F	C	I,H,T	Yes	Yes	D	D
Craven	C,I	P,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	I,T	No	No		
Forsyth	C,W <sup>b</sup>	I,H,T	C	I,H,T	No	Yes		E
Halifax	C,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	H	C,T	P,I,H	Yes	No	D,O	
Haywood	C,P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>		C,T	P,I	No	No		
Yancey	C	P,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	I,H,T	Yes	Yes	D,Q,R,O	E,N,A,D
*North Dakota								
Cass	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Emmons	C,O <sup>a</sup>	P,I,T	C,O <sup>a</sup>	P,I,T	No	No		
Grand Forks	C,I,T	P,H,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Hountrail	C,I	P,H,T	C,I	P,H,T	No	Yes		A
Stutsman	C,I	P,T	C,I	P,T	No	No		
Ohio	C,I,F	T		C,I	Yes	Yes	P,N,A,D,Q,R	P,N,A,D
Cuyahoga	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	Yes	D	P,N,D
Delaware	C	P,I,H,T	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Franklin	C,T	P,I,W <sup>b</sup>	C,T	P,I	No	No		
Mahoning	C	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	Yes	Yes	D,Q,R	N,A,D
Richland	C,H	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		

TABLE A. 10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not Used	Always Used	Not Used				
Oklahoma	C,T	I,H	C,T	I,H	Yes	Yes	H,N,A,D,Q,R	E,N,A,D,O <sup>e</sup>
Carter	**							
Custer	**							
Oregon	C	I,H,T,F	C	T	Yes	No	P,N,A,D,Q,R	
Albany	C	I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	I,H,T	No	No		
Cottage Grove	C	P,I,T	C	P,I,T	No	No		
East Portland	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Springfield	C	T	C	P,I,T	No	Yes		D
West Eugene	C	P,I,H,T	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Pennsylvania	C	T,F	C	I,T	Yes	No	Q,R	
Lycoming	C	P,I,H,T	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	No	D,Q,R,W <sup>b</sup>	
Philadelphia (Center)	C,T	P,I	C,T	P,I	No	No		
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	C,T	P,I,H	C,T	P,I,H	No	No		
Philadelphia (West)	C,T	P,I,H	C,T	P,I,H	DK	No		
Westmoreland	C	P,I,H,T	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Rhode Island	C	I,P,H,T,F	C	I,H,T,P	No	No		
Providence	**							
Warwick	**							
South Carolina	C	I,H,T	C	I,H,T	No	Yes		H
Darlington	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C,I	P,H,T	No	Yes		H,P,E,N,A,D
Georgetown	C	P,I,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,T	No	No		
Newberry	C,I	P,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C,I	P,H,T	Yes	Yes	N,D,Q,R	E,A
Orangeburg	C	P,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	No	No		
Richland	C	P,I,H,T,W <sup>b</sup>	C	P,I,H,T	Yes	Yes	D,Q	H,E

TABLE A. 10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not Always Used	Always Used	Not Always Used				
South Dakota	C, I, T	H	C, P	I	No	No		
Bennett	**							
Davison	**							
Tennessee	C, I, H, T	C			No	No		
Davidson	C, T	P, I, H, W <sup>b</sup>	C, T	P	Yes	No	N, A, D, Q, R, M <sup>b</sup>	
Sumner	C	P, I, T, W <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, T	No	No		
Texas	C, I	H, T, F	C	I, H, T	Yes	No	H, D, Q, R	
* Bexar								
DelWitt	Ref.	Ref.	C	P, I, H, T	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	N, A
* Harris								
Smith	C	P, I, H, T	C	P, I, H, T	No	No		
Tarrant	C, I	P, H, W <sup>b</sup>	C, P, I, T	H	Yes	Yes	D	A, D
Utah	C	I, H, T, F	C	I, H, T	No	No		
Region 2B	**							
Region 7A	**							
Vermont	C, H, T	I, F	C	I, H, T	No	No		
Hartford	**							
St. Albans	**							
Virginia	C, T	I, H, F, O <sup>f</sup>	C	I, H, T	Yes	Yes	P, D, Q, R	P, A, D
Charlotte	C, P, I, T, W <sup>b</sup>	H	C, I, T	P, H	Yes	No	H, D, Q, R, M <sup>b</sup>	
Hampton IC	C, T, W <sup>b</sup>	P, I, H	C, T	P, I	Yes	Yes	N, A, D, Q, R, M <sup>b</sup>	E, N, A, D
Norfolk IC	C, T, W <sup>b</sup>	P, I, H	C	P, I, H, T	Yes	Yes	H, N, A, D, Q, R, M <sup>b</sup>	E, A, D
* Portsmouth								
Pulaski	C, T	P, I, H, W <sup>b</sup>	C, T	P, I	No	No		

TABLE A. 10 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Methods Used to Investigate the Claim and an Estimation of Their Frequency of Use				Existence of System for Prioritizing Cases		Characteristics of Case Which Increase Likelihood of Investigation	
	Suspected Fraud (Q5.18)		Nonfraud (Q5.11)		Suspected Fraud (Q5.19)	Nonfraud (Q5.12)	Suspected Fraud (Q5.20)	Nonfraud (Q5.13)
	Always Used	Not Always Used	Always Used	Not Always Used				
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	C, I, H, T	F	C, I, T	H	No	Yes		D
Washington	C	I, H, T, F	C	I, T	Yes	Yes	N, D, Q, R	A, D, O <sup>9</sup>
Benton	C	P, I, T	C	P, I, T	No	Yes		N, A, D
King-Rainier	C, I, T	P, H	C	P, I, T	Yes	Yes	N, A, D, Q, R, M <sup>b</sup>	P, E, N, A, D
Pierce	C, T	P, I, H, M <sup>b</sup>	C, T	P, I	Yes	No	N, A, Q, R	
Spokane	C		C		No	No		
Vancouver	C	P, I, H, T, M <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, H, T	Yes	Yes	N, A, D, Q, R	N, A
West Virginia	C, I, T	F	C	I, T, O <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Yes	D, Q, R	E, A, D
Beckley	**							
Charleston	**							
Wisconsin	C	I, H, T	C	I, H, T	No	No		
Bayfield	C, T	P, H, M <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I	Yes	No	R	
Douglas	C	P, I, T, M <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, T	Yes	No	N, D, R	
Milwaukee	C	P, I, H, T	C	P, I, H, T	Yes	Yes	D	N, A, D
Rock	C	P, I, H, T, M <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, T	Yes	No	H, P, N, A, D, Q, R, M <sup>b</sup>	
Sauk	C, T	P, I, M <sup>b</sup>	C, T	P, I	No	No		
Wyoming	C	I, H, T, F, O <sup>h</sup>	C	I	Yes	No	D, Q, R	
Carbon	C	P, I, H, T	C, T	P, I, H	No	No		
Crook	C, I, H, T, O <sup>1</sup>		C, O <sup>k</sup>	P, I, H, T	Yes	Yes	D, Q, R, M <sup>b</sup>	D
Freemont	C, I	T	C, I	T	No	No		
Natrona	C	P, I, H, T, M <sup>b</sup>	C	P, I, H, T	No	No		
Park	C, T	P	C, T	P	No	No		



TABLE A.10 (continued)

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in the interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSP system.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. The respondent refused to answer the question.

KEYS: Methods: C = Case file review

I = In-office interview

P = Telephone interview

H = Home visit

T = Third-party contact

F = Forensic investigation

W = Interview witness

O = Other

Characteristics of Case: H = Age/health/employment status of client

P = PA household

E = Household error

M = Recent error/claim

A = Active case

D = Dollar amount

M = Fraud in multiple programs

Q = Quality of evidence

R = Repeat offender/flagrant violation

O = Other

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>This was not included as a possible response in the census instruments but was listed as an "other" method often enough for inclusion as a separate response possibility in the survey instruments.

<sup>c</sup>Record check in another program's case records.

<sup>d</sup>Computer match.

<sup>e</sup>Error due to unreported income.

<sup>f</sup>Referral to prosecutor for more thorough investigation.

<sup>g</sup>Costs of follow-up.

<sup>h</sup>Mental evaluation of client.

<sup>i</sup>Duplicate participation check.

<sup>j</sup>Computer inquiry.

<sup>k</sup>Check references.

<sup>l</sup>Check property records.

<sup>m</sup>Letter to client.

<sup>n</sup>Cases of suspected fraud are investigated by the state FSA.

<sup>o</sup>A case of suspected fraud has never been pursued in this local FSA.

TABLE A.11

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT STAGE OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (Q6.00)					Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (Q6.03)	Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (Q6.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (Q6.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification	Administrative	Waiver	Fraud		Nonfraud	Fraud			
		Consent	Disqualification	of				Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud	
		Agreement	Hearing	Hearing							
Alabama	2	3	1	4	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	LS	AL	AL	
Bibb	4	3	1	2	D	Yes	Yes	DK	AL	AL	
Etowah	3	4	2	1	D,R,F	No	No	LS	AL	AL	
Franklin	3	2	1	4	D,S,M	Yes	Yes	LS	CL	CL	
Mobile	2	4	1	3	D,R,F,S,M	Yes	Yes	LS	CL	CL	
Morgan	3	1	4	1	D <sup>h</sup>	No	No	LS	AL	AL	
Alaska	3	1	4	2	D,F	Yes	Yes	FS	FS	CS	
Anchorage-Muldoon	**										
Ketchikan	**										
Arizona	4	2	3	1	D	Yes	Yes	LS	CS	CS	
Maricopa	**										
Navajo	**										
Arkansas	3	4	1	2	D,R,F	No	Yes	LS	CS	CS	
Clay	**										
Phillips	**										
*California											
Los Angeles	2		1		D,R,F,S	Yes	Yes	FL	CL	CL	
San Bernardino	1		2		D,R,S	Yes	Yes	FL,LL	CL	CL	
San Joaquin	1		2		M,D,R,F,S	No	No	CL	CL	CL	
* Sonoma											
* Yolo											

TABLE A.11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (Q6.00)				Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (Q6.03)	Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (Q6.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (Q6.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification	Administrative	Waiver		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud		
		Consent	Disqualification	of				Court-Established	Other	Nonfraud
		Agreement	Hearing	Hearing						
Colorado	2	3	1		D,F	Yes	Yes	CL,LL	CL	CL
Boulder	2		1		R,F,S	Yes	Yes	CL	CL	CL
Denver	2		1		M	No	No	FL,LS	AL	AL,CL
Gunnison-Hinsdale	2		1		D,R,S	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
* Mesa										
Pueblo	2		1		D,R,F,S	No	No	CL	CL	CL
Connecticut	1	3	2	4	D,F,S,H	Yes	Yes	LS	FS	AL
* New Haven										
* Torrington										
Delaware	X	X <sup>b</sup>	X	X <sup>b</sup>	D,R,F	DK	DK	CS,LS	CS,LS	CS
New Castle	**									
Sussex	**									
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	1	4	2	3	D,R,F	Yes	No	LS	CS	CS
Florida	1	4	2	3	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	CD,LD	CD	CD
Dade	**									
Polk	**									
Georgia	2	1	3	4	D,R,F,	No	No	LS	FS	Automated
Bibb	3	1	4	1	D,F,S	Yes	Yes	FD	FD	Automated
Colquitt	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	No	Yes	LD	FD	CL
Fulton	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	No	LD	FD	AL,Automated
Madison	3	1	2	4	D,R,F,S	DK	Yes	FD	FD	Automated
* Peach										
Guam <sup>a</sup>	3	4	1	2	D,M	No	No	FS	FS	FS
Hawaii	3	4	2	1	D,R,F	No	No	FS	AL	AL
Honolulu	**									
Maul	**									

TABLE A.11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (Q6.00)				Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (Q6.03)	Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (Q6.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (Q6.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification	Administrative	Waiver		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud		
		Consent	Disqualification	of				Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud
		Agreement	Hearing	Hearing						
Idaho	3	1	2		D,R,F	Yes	Yes	FD	FD	AL
*Ada										
*Bonneville										
*Canyon										
*Owyhee										
*Shoshone										
Illinois	4	1 <sup>b</sup>	3	1 <sup>b</sup>	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	CS	CS	CS
Cook Co. (Ashland)	NA <sup>f</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cook Co. (Englewood)	NA <sup>f</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cook Co. (Garfield)	NA <sup>f</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	NA <sup>f</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greene	NA <sup>f</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	2		1		D,R,F	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
Adams	NA <sup>f</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Allen	2		1		D,R,F,S	Yes	No	CL	CL	CL
Marion	1					No	No	LL	NA <sup>d</sup>	CL
Scott			1			No	No	NA <sup>j</sup>	AL	CL
Wayne	1		2		D,R,F,S	No	No	CL,LL	CL	CL
Iowa	1		2		D,R,F,S	Yes	No	CS	CS	CS
Iowa	**									
Webster	**									
Kansas	3	4	1	2	D,R,F,M	Yes	Yes	LL	AL	AL
Cherokee	2		1			No	No	LS	LS	AL
Franklin	2	4	1	3	D,R,S	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
Linn			1	1	D,R,S	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
Wichita	4	2	1	2	D,R,F,S	No	No	FL,LS	FL	AL,CL
Wyandotte	1		2	3	D,R,F,S	Yes	Yes	LS	FL	FL

TABLE A.11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (Q6.00)					Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (Q6.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (Q6.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification	Administrative Disqualification	Waiver of	Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (Q6.03)	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud		
		Consent Agreement	Hearing	Hearing				Court-Established	Other	Nonfraud
Kentucky	3	4	2	1	D	Yes	Yes	LL	AL <sup>f</sup> , CL <sup>b</sup> , CS <sup>e</sup>	AL <sup>f</sup> , CL <sup>f</sup> , CS <sup>e</sup>
Bell	3		2	1	D	No	No	AL	AL	AL
Carter	4	1	3	1	D, R	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
Hart	3	4	2	1	D, R, F, S	No	No	AL, FS	AL, FS	AL, CS
Jefferson	3	2	1	4	NA	Yes	Yes	AL, CL	AL, CL	AL, CL
Todd	4	1	3	2	D, F, S	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
Louisiana	3	4	2	1	D, R, F	Yes	Yes	LS	FS	CS
Caddo	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lincoln	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Orleans	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
St. Tammany	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tangipahoa	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Maine	4	2	1	3	D, R, F	Yes	Yes	LL	AL	AL
Augusta	4	2	3	1	D, R, F	No	No	AL, LL	AL	AL
Lewiston	4	2	1	2	D, S	No	No	LL	AL	AL
Maryland	1	2	4	3	D, R, F	No	No	AL	AL	AL
Allegany	2	1			D, F	Yes	No	LS	NA <sup>j</sup>	AL
Baltimore City	4	1	3	2	M	Yes	Yes	CL	CL	CL
Baltimore County	1		3	2	D, S	No	No	LS	AS	CL
Frederick	3		2	1	F	Yes	Yes	FS, LL	AL	AL
Montgomery	X	X	X	X	M	Yes	Yes	CL	CL	CL
Massachusetts	2	4	1	3	D, R	Yes	Yes	LS	CS	CS
Malden	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Roslindale	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

TABLE A. 11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (06.00)					Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (06.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (06.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification Consent Agreement	Administrative Disqualification Hearing	Waiver of Hearing	Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (06.03)	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud		
								Court-Established	Other	Nonfraud
Michigan	4	3	2	1	D,R,F	No	No	AL	AL	AL
Berrien	2	1	3	4	D,R,F,S	No	No	CL	CL	CL
Branch	2	1			D,R,F	Yes	No	LS	FL	AL, Automated
Macomb	1	2	3	4	D,F	Yes	Yes	CL	CL	AL
St. Clair	3	1	2	4	D	Yes	Yes	CL	CL	CL
Wayne	4	2	1	3	N,R,F,S	Yes	No	CL, LS, Automated	CL, LS, Automated	CL
Minnesota	X				D,R,F	Yes	Yes	AL, CL	NA <sup>j</sup>	AL, CL
Clay	1	2			N,D,R,F,S	No	No	FL	CL	CL
Dakota	X					Yes	Yes	LL	NA <sup>j</sup>	AL
Hennepin	X	X			D,R,S	Yes	No	FL, CL	NA <sup>j</sup>	CL
Ramsey	X					No	Yes	FL	NA <sup>j</sup>	CL
Waseca	NA <sup>k</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	No	NA	NA	AL
Mississippi	2	4	1	2	D	Yes	Yes	CS	CS	CS
Attala	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hinds	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lowndes	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Madison	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tishomingo	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Missouri	3	1 <sup>b</sup>	4	1 <sup>b</sup>	D,R,F, O <sup>c</sup>	No	No	Automated	Automated	Automated
Buchanan	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	FS	FS	CL
Jackson	4	1	3	2	NA <sup>i</sup>	No	No	CS, Automated	AS	CS, Automated
Lafayette	4	2	3	1	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	No	LS	FS	Automated
Pettis	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
St. Louis	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Montana	2		1	3	D,R,F	Yes	No	LL	AL	AL
Cascade			2	1	D,S	No	No	CL	FL	FL
Lewis & Clark			2	1	NA <sup>i</sup>	Yes	Yes	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	FL

TABLE A.11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (Q6.00)				Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (Q6.03)	Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (Q6.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (Q6.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification	Administrative Disqualification	Waiver of		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud		
		Consent Agreement	Hearing	Hearing				Court-Established	Other	Nonfraud
Nebraska	3	1 <sup>b</sup>	2	1 <sup>b</sup>	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	AS	AS	AL
Grand Island			X			Yes	Yes	MA <sup>i</sup>	AL	AL
Lexington	4	2	1	2	DK	No	No	FS	FS	AL
Lincoln	X	X	X	X	R,S	No	No	CL	CL	CL
Omaha	3	2		1	D,R,F,S	Yes	Yes	CL	CL	CL
Seward	X	X	X	X	DK	Yes	Yes	DK	DK	AL
Nevada	4	3	1	2	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	LL	CL	CL
Clark	**									
Washoe	**									
New Hampshire	1		3	2	D,R,F	No	Yes	FS	CS	CS
Dover	**									
Keene	**									
New Jersey	1	4	3	2	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	CL,LL	CL	CL
Burlington	4	3	2	1	D,R	No	No	LS	LS	CL
Camden	1		3	2	R,S	Yes	Yes	CL,LS	FL,CL	CL
Essex	3		2	1	D,R,F,S	No	No	CL,CS	LS	CL
Hudson	2	3	4	1	N,D,R	No	No	CL,LS	CL,LS	CL
Middlesex	1	2	4	2	D,R,F,S	No	No	LS	LS	CL
New Mexico	4	3	1	2	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	CS	CS	CS
Bernalillo	4	2	1	2	D,F,S	No	No	CS,Automated	CS,Automated	CS,Automated
Cibola	4	2	1	3	D	No	No	Automated	Automated	Automated
New York	1	4	2	3	G <sup>d</sup>	Yes	Yes	AL,CL,FL	AL,CL,FL	AL,CL,FL
* Broome										
Cortland	X					No	No	CL	CL	CL
Erie	1	2			S	No	No	FL	AL,CL	AL,CL
New York City	2	X	1	X	D	Yes	Yes	CL,LL	CL	CL
* Onondaga										

TABLE A.11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (06.00)					Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (06.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (06.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification Consent Agreement	Administrative Disqualification Hearing	Waiver of Hearing	Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (06.03)	Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud		Nonfraud
								Court-Established	Other	
North Carolina	X	2	1	X	D	No	No	LL	AL	Automated
Craven	2		3	1	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	LL	CL	CL
Forsyth	2		1	3	R,F	No	No	LL	AL	CL
Halifax	1	4	2	2	S	Yes	Yes	CL	CL	AS
Haywood	X					No	Yes	CL	CL	CL
Yancey	4	3	1	2	DK	Yes	No	AL	AL	Automated
*North Dakota										
Cass	4	3	2	1	D,R,F	No	No	AL	AL	AL
Emmons	4	2	3	1	N	No	No	LS	AL,LS	AL
Grand Fork		1	3	2		Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
Mountrail		1	3	2		Yes	Yes	NA	AL	AL
Stutsman	4	1	3	2	R	No	No	AL	AL	AL
Ohio	1	3	4	2	D,R,F	No	No	CL	CL	CL
Cuyahoga	X				F	Yes	Yes	CL	NA <sup>d</sup>	CL
Delaware	X				F	No	No	LL	NA <sup>d</sup>	AL
Franklin	1	2	3	3	D,F,S	Yes	Yes	FL,LL	CL	CL
Mahoning	2	1			F	No	No	LL	FL	FL
Richland	X				N,D,R,F	No	No	CL	NA <sup>d</sup>	AL
Oklahoma	3		1	2	D,R,F,O <sup>c</sup>	Yes	No	FS	CS	CS
Carter	**									
Custer	**									
Oregon	2	1 <sup>b</sup>	3	1 <sup>b</sup>	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	CS	CS	Automated
Albany	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cottage Grove	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
East Portland	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Springfield		3	1	2	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	No	NA	NA	NA
West Eugene	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA



TABLE A.11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (Q6.00)					Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (Q6.03)	Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (Q6.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (Q6.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification	Administrative	Waiver	Fraud		Nonfraud	Fraud			
		Consent	Disqualification	of				Court-	Established	Other	Nonfraud
		Agreement	Hearing	Hearing							
Pennsylvania	X	X			D,R	Yes	Yes	CS	CS	CS	
Lycoming	NA <sup>1</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Philadelphia (Center)	NA <sup>1</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	NA <sup>1</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Philadelphia (West)	NA <sup>1</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Westmoreland	NA <sup>1</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Rhode Island	4	3	1	2	D,R,F	No	No	LS	CS	CS	
Providence	**										
Warwick	**										
South Carolina	4	2	3	1	D,R,P	Yes	Yes	LL	CL	CL	
Darlington	4	1	3	1	D,R,F,S	Yes	No	CL,LS	CL	CL	
Georgetown	2	4	1	3	R,F,S	Yes	No	CL,FS	CL	CL	
Newberry	4	1	3	2	R,F,S	Yes	No	LS	CL	CL	
Orangeburg		1	2	3	R,F	Yes	Yes	LS	CL	CL	
Richland	3	4	2	1	M,D,R,F,S	Yes	No	FS	CL	CL	
South Dakota	3	4	2	1	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	LS	OS <sup>f</sup>	CD	
Bennett	**										
Davison	**										
Tennessee	3	1 <sup>b</sup>	2	1 <sup>b</sup>	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL	
Davidson	4	1	3	1	D,R,S	No	No	LS	CL	CL	
Sumner	4	3	2	1	D,R,F,S	No	No	CD	AL	AL	
Texas	1		2	3	D,R,H	Yes	Yes	LL	FL	AL	
* Bexar											
DeWitt	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	
* Harris											
Smith	2	X	1	3	DK	No	No	FS	FS	AL	
Tarrant	2	3	1	4	D,F,S	No	No	FD	FD	CD	

TABLE A.11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (Q6.00)				Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (Q6.03)	Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (Q6.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Notifying Household of the Claim (Q6.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification	Administrative	Waiver		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud		
		Consent	Disqualification	of				Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud
		Agreement	Hearing	Hearing						
Utah	4	2	3	1	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	CL	CL	CL
Region 2B	**									
Region 7A	**									
Vermont	1	2	4	3	D,R,F	Yes	Yes	LS	FS	AL
Hartford	**									
St. Albans	**									
Virginia	1	2			D,R,F	Yes	Yes	CL,FL	NA <sup>d</sup>	AL
Charlotte	1	2			D,R,F,S	No	No	FL	FL	AL
Hampton IC	X					Yes	Yes	CL	CL	CL
Norfolk IC	1	2			A,N,D,R,F,S	No	No	FL	FL	AL
* Portsmouth										
Pulaski	1	2	3	4	D,R,F,S	No	No	FL,LS	FL	AL
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	4	3	1	2	D,R,F	No	No	LL	CD	CD
Washington	2	3 <sup>b</sup>	1	3 <sup>b</sup>	D,R	No	No	AL	AL	AL
Benton	2		1		D,R,F,S	Yes	No	CL	CL	CL
King-Rainier	1	2	4	3	D,R,F,S	No	No	CL	CL	CL
Pierce	1	3	2		D,S	No	No	AL,FL	AL,FL	AL
Spokane		X	1			Yes	Yes	AL,CL	AL,CL	AL,CL
Vancouver	2	2	1		NA <sup>i</sup>	No	No	CL	CL	CL
West Virginia	3	1 <sup>b</sup>	2	1 <sup>b</sup>	D	Yes	Yes	LS	CS	CS
Beckley	**									
Charleston	**									

TABLE A.11 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Ranking of Methods Used To Establish Fraud Claims (Q6.00)				Factors Entering into the Decision to Refer a Case for Prosecution (Q6.03)	Use of Management Review of Decision To Establish the Claim (Q6.05)		Functional Level of Staff Responsible For Notifying Household of the Claim (Q6.08)		
	Criminal Prosecution	Disqualification Consent	Administrative Disqualification Hearing	Waiver of Hearing		Fraud	Nonfraud	Fraud		
		Agreement						Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud
Wisconsin	X				D	No	No	LL	NA <sup>d</sup>	AL
Bayfield	4	1	3	2	N,R,F,S	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
Douglas	X				A	Yes	Yes	AL	NA <sup>d</sup>	AL
Milwaukee			1	1		No	No	NA <sup>j</sup>	CL	CL
Rock	1		2		D,F,S	Yes	Yes	LL	FL	FL
Sauk	X				D,R,F	Yes	Yes	LL	AL	AL
Wyoming	3	2	1		D,F,S	Yes	Yes	LL	CD	AL
Carbon	3		1	2	D,F,S	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL
Crook	4	3	1	2	D,R,F,S	Yes	Yes	AL,CS	AL,CS	AL,CS
Freemont	4	3	1	2	N,D,R,F,S	Yes	Yes	AL,CS	AL,CS	AL,CS
Natrona	2	4	1	3	D	Yes	Yes	AL,LL,CS	AL,CS	AL
Park	NA <sup>i</sup>	NA	NA	NA	D,R,F,S	Yes	Yes	AL	AL	AL

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in the interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSP system.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. The respondent refused to answer the question.

TABLE A.11 (continued)

KEYS: Ranking: 1-4 = Ranking of methods by frequency of use  
X = Method used, but not ranked or  
only method that was used

Factors Entering Decision: D = Dollar Amount  
R = Repeat Offender  
F = Flagrant Violation  
S = Strength of Evidence  
H = Age/Health of Client  
N = Nonresponsive household  
A = All fraud prosecuted  
M = Fraud in multiple programs  
O = Other

Functional Level: A = Agency  
C = Claims/Collection Unit  
F = Fraud/Investigation Unit  
L = Legal Authority  
D = Other

For each of the above,  
code whether it is:  
L = Local/County  
D = District/Region  
S = State

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>The Disqualification Consent Agreement and Waiver of Hearing are a single process in this state.

<sup>c</sup>Prosecutor's interest, time, and/or available funds for pursuing food stamp fraud.

<sup>d</sup>All cases are referred for prosecution.

<sup>e</sup>Inactive cases only.

<sup>f</sup>Active cases only.

<sup>g</sup>State Administrative Disqualification Hearing Unit.

<sup>h</sup>Referred for prosecution only if caseworker supervisor is unable to work out arrangement with client regarding fraud claims; because the courts are years behind schedule, numerous attempts are made to avoid lengthy court procedures.

<sup>i</sup>Cases of suspected fraud are established at the state level.

<sup>j</sup>Court-established fraud cases are not pursued.

<sup>k</sup>Fraud is so seldom suspected, it has never been pursued in this local FSA.

TABLE A.12

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROCESS BY WHICH ARRANGEMENTS ARE MADE  
WITH THE HOUSEHOLD FOR PAYMENT OF THE CLAIM, BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud					
	Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud			
Alabama	LL	AL	AL	No schedule	Varies <sup>c</sup>	L
Bibb	LS,LL	AL	AL	30	3	None
Etowah	CL,LS,LL	CL	CL	30	No standard	P
Franklin	LS,LL	CL	CL	No schedule	Varies	None <sup>h</sup>
Mobile	LS,LL	CL	CL	30	DK,Varies <sup>e</sup>	DK, None <sup>e</sup>
Morgan	LS,LL	AL	AL	30	3	L,P
Alaska	FS	FS	CS	No schedule,30 <sup>e</sup>	None,4 <sup>e</sup>	B
Anchorage-Muldoon	**					
Ketchikan	**					
Arizona	CS	CS	CS	30	3	B,P
Maricopa	**					
Navajo	**					
Arkansas	LS	CS	CS	30 <sup>e</sup> ,No schedule	9	B
Clay	**					
Phillips	**					
*California						
Los Angeles	LL	CL	CL	30	1	L
San Bernardino	LL	CL	CL	30	1	None
San Joaquin	FL	CL	CL	30	3	B,L,P
* Sonoma						
* Yolo						

TABLE A. 12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud					
	Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud			
Colorado	AL,LL	CL	CL	30	3	B,P
Boulder	CL	CL	CL	30	Varies	B,D
Denver	FL	AL	AL	No schedule	No standard	None
Gunnison-Hinsdale	LL,FS	AL	AL	No schedule	No standard	None
* Mesa						
Pueblo	CL,LL,FS	CL	CL	30	3	None
Connecticut	LS	CS	CL <sup>b</sup> ,CS	30	3	I
* New Haven						
* Torrington						
Delaware	CS,LS	CS	CS	30	3	L
New Castle	**					
Sussex	**					
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	LS	CS	CS	NA <sup>g</sup> ,30 <sup>e</sup>	NA <sup>g</sup> ,3 <sup>e</sup>	L,P
Florida	CD,LD	CD	CD	30	3	B
Dade	**					
Polk	**					
Georgia	LS <sup>b</sup>	FS	AL	Varies <sup>c</sup>	16 <sup>d</sup>	P
Bibb	LL,FD	FD	AL,Automated	0 <sup>n</sup> ,30 <sup>n,e</sup>	1,No standard,Varies <sup>f</sup>	None,0 <sup>h</sup>
Colquitt	LL,FD	FD	CL,Automated	NA	NA	None
Fulton	LL,FD	FD	AL	30	Varies	L <sup>1</sup>
Madison	FD	FD	AL,Automated	No schedule	Varies	None
* Peach						
Guam <sup>a</sup>	FS	FS	FS	No schedule	1,Varies <sup>c</sup> ,3 <sup>f</sup>	P,H

TABLE A. 12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud					
	Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud			
Hawaii	FS	AL	AL	30	No standard	B
Honolulu	**					
Mau	**					
Idaho	CD,FD	CD,FD	AL	30	3	B,P
* Ada						
* Bonnevill						
* Canyon						
* Owyhee						
* Shoshone						
Illinois	AL,CS	AL,CS	AL,CS	No schedule	3	B
Cook Co. (Ashland)	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Cook Co. (Englewood)	DK	DK	CS	DK	DK	None
Cook Co. (Garfield)	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Greene	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Indiana	LL	AL	AL	30	No standard	None
Adams	NA <sup>s</sup>	NA <sup>s</sup>	AL	NA,30 <sup>e</sup>	NA, No standard <sup>e</sup>	L
Allen	LL	CL	CL	No schedule	No standard	None, L, J, e
Marion	CL, LL	NA <sup>t</sup>	CL	No schedule	NA, 5 <sup>e</sup>	L
Scott	NA <sup>n</sup>	AL	AL	30	3	
Wayne	CL	CL	CL	30	No standard	L, None <sup>e</sup>
Iowa	CS	CS	CS	30	4	B
Iowa	**					
Webster	**					

TABLE A.12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud					
	Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud			
Kansas	FD,LD	AL	AL	90	5	None
Cherokee	LS,FD	AL,FD	AL	NA	1	None
Franklin	FD,AL,Automated	AL,FD,Automated	AL,Automated	NA		
Linn	FD,AL	AL,FD	AL	NA		
Wichita	CL	CL	AL	30	1	None
Wyandotte	FL,LL	FL	AL,FL	No schedule	No standard	None,L,p <sup>k</sup>
Kentucky	LS	AL,CL,CS	AL,CL,CS	10	3	P
Bell	AL,CS	AL,CS	AL,CS	30 <sup>1</sup>	1,1 No standard <sup>f</sup>	None
Carter	AL,CS	AL,CS	AL,CS	30	1	None
Hart	AL,CS	AL,CS	AL,CS	30	NA <sup>r</sup>	None
Jefferson	FS	CL	CL	30	DK	None
Todd	AL,CS	AL,CS	AL,CS	No schedule	No standard	None
Louisiana	LS	FS	CS	30	3	B,P
Caddo	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Lincoln	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Orleans	NA <sup>r</sup>					
St. Tammany	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Tangipahoa	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Maine	LS	LS	AL	No schedule	1	None
Augusta	AL,LL	AL	AL	30	1	None
Lewiston	LL	AL	AL	30	1	None
Maryland	AL	AL	AL	30	3	L
Allegany	LS	NA <sup>t</sup>	AL	NA <sup>g</sup> ,30 <sup>e</sup>	NA <sup>g</sup> ,2 <sup>e</sup>	None
Baltimore City	LL	CL	CL	30	3	None
Baltimore County	LS	CL	CL	30	3	None
Frederick	LS	AL	AL	30	1	None
Montgomery	CL	CL	CL	30	3	None



TABLE A, 12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud		Nonfraud			
	Court- Established	Other				
Massachusetts	LS	FS,LS	CS	30	4,3 <sup>e</sup>	None
Malden	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Roslindale	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Michigan	AL	AL	AL	30	3	None
Berrien	FS	CL,FD	CL	Varies	3	0 <sup>h</sup> ,None <sup>1</sup>
Branch	Automated,CL,AL	AL,Automated	AL,Automated	30	3	None
Macomb	FL	CL	AL	No schedule,30 <sup>e</sup>	3	None
St. Clair	CL,Automated	CL,Automated	CL,Automated	60	3	None
Wayne	LL,FS	CL,LL	AL,CL	3	4,3,3 <sup>1</sup>	None
Minnesota	CL	NA <sup>t</sup>	CL	30	No standard	B
Clay	CL	CL	CL	30	7	B,L,P
Dakota	AL,CL	NA <sup>t</sup>	AL	30	3	None
Hennepin	LL,AL	NA <sup>t</sup>	CL	NA,30 <sup>e</sup>	1	None
Ramsey	CL,LL,Automated	NA <sup>t</sup>	CL	30	1	B,L
Waseca	NA <sup>s</sup>	NA <sup>t</sup>	AL	30	3	None
Mississippi	AL	AS	AL	30	3	None
Attala	LS	CS	CS	No schedule	3	NA <sup>r</sup>
Hinds	LS	AL	AL	DK	DK	L
Lowndes	AL	AL	AL	NA <sup>r</sup>	NA	None
Madison	AL,LS	AL	AL	No schedule	DK	None
Tishomingo	NA <sup>r</sup>	AL	AL	NA <sup>r</sup>	NA	None
Missouri	FD	FD	AL	30	5	B
Buchanan	AL,FS	AL,FS	AL	30	No standard,4 <sup>e</sup>	NA,B <sup>e</sup>
Jackson	FS	CL	CL	30	NA <sup>s</sup>	None
Lafayette	FS	FS	AL	None,30 <sup>g</sup>	None,3 <sup>g</sup>	None
Pettis	NA <sup>r</sup>	NA	AL	NA <sup>r</sup>	NA	None
St. Louis	NA <sup>r</sup>	NA	CL	None <sup>r</sup> ,30 <sup>g</sup>	NA,No standard <sup>e</sup>	None

TABLE A. 12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud					
	Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud			
Montana	LL	AL	AL	30	3	None
Cascade	AL,FL	AL,FL	AL,CL	No schedule	No standard	None
Lewis & Clark	NA <sup>T</sup>	NA <sup>T</sup>	AL,FL	No schedule	Varies	None
Nebraska	AS	AS	AL	30	3,2 <sup>e</sup>	None
Grand Island	NA <sup>U</sup>	AL	AL	30	Varies	None <sup>i</sup>
Lexington	AS	AS	AL	30	DK,1 <sup>e</sup>	DK, None <sup>e</sup>
Lincoln	CL	CL	CL	30	1	None
Omaha	CL,FL	CL	CL	30	1	L
Seward	DK	DK	AL	DK, No schedule <sup>e</sup>	DK,1 <sup>e</sup>	DK, L <sup>e</sup>
Nevada	LL	CL	CL	30	No standard	P
Clark	**					
Washoe	**					
New Hampshire	FS	CS	CS	No schedule	No standard	P
Dover	**					
Keene	**					
New Jersey	AL,LL	AL	AL	30	1,1,3 <sup>f</sup>	L,P
Burlington	LL	LL	CL	30	No standard	L
Camden	CL	CL	CL	30	Varies	B
Essex	LL	CL	CL	30	3	None
Hudson	CL	CL	CL	No schedule	No standard	L
Middlesex	LL	FL	CL	No schedule, 30 <sup>C</sup>	No standard	L, 0 <sup>q</sup> , None <sup>h</sup>
New Mexico	CS	CS	CS	30	Varies <sup>C</sup>	B,P
Bernalillo	NA <sup>T</sup>					
Cibola	NA <sup>T</sup>					

TABLE A.12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud					
	Court- Established	Other	Nonfraud			
New York	AL,CL,FL,LL	AL,CL,FL	AL,CL,FL	30	3	None
* Broome						
Cortland	CL	CL	CL	30	Varies	L
Erie	CL	CL	CL	No schedule	3	B,L,P
New York City	CL	CL	CL	30	1	None
* Onondaga						
North Carolina	AL,LL	AL	AL	30	3	B,P
Craven	LL	CL	CL	30,30,DK <sup>f</sup>	Varies	B,L <sup>m</sup>
Forsyth	LL	CL	CL	30,30,None <sup>f</sup>	NA, No standard <sup>e</sup>	None,L <sup>n</sup>
Halifax	CL	CL	AL	No schedule,30 <sup>e</sup>	No standard,4,5 <sup>f</sup>	L,P,O <sup>h</sup>
Haywood	CL	CL	CL	No schedule	No standard	P
Yancey	DK	AL	AL	30	No standard	None <sup>i</sup>
*North Dakota						
Cass	AL,LL	AL	AL	30	3	L
Emmons	LL	AL,LL	AL	No schedule,30 <sup>e</sup>	No standard,Varies <sup>e</sup>	B,L <sup>e</sup>
Grand Forks	AL	AL	AL	30	1 <sup>o</sup>	None
Hountrail	NA <sup>u</sup>	AL	AL	30	3	None <sup>i</sup>
Stutsman	AL	AL	AL	30	No standard	None
Ohio	CL	CL	CL	30	Varies <sup>c</sup>	P
Cuyahoga	CL	NA <sup>t</sup>	CL	180	3	L,P
Delaware	LL	NA <sup>t</sup>	AL	No schedule	No standard	None
Franklin	LL	CL	CL	No schedule	No standard,6,1 <sup>f</sup>	L
Mahoning	LL	NA <sup>t</sup>	FL	30	3	L
Richland	AL	NA <sup>t</sup>	AL	30	Varies	L,None <sup>e</sup>
Oklahoma	FS	CS	CS	No schedule,30 <sup>e</sup>	NA,Varies <sup>c,e</sup>	H
Carter	**					
Custer	**					

TABLE A.12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud					
	Court-					
	Established	Other	Nonfraud			
Oregon	CS	CS	CS	30	3,4,1 <sup>f</sup>	B
Albany	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Cottage Grove	NA <sup>r</sup>					
East Portland	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Springfield	NA <sup>r</sup>					
West Eugene	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Pennsylvania	LS	NA	CS	NA <sup>g</sup> ,30 <sup>e</sup>	NA,3 <sup>e</sup>	B
Lycoming	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Philadelphia (Center)	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Philadelphia (West)	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Westmoreland	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Rhode Island	LS	CS	CS	30	2,2,Varies <sup>c,f</sup>	None
Providence	**					
Warwick	**					
South Carolina	LL	CL	AL,CL	30	Varies <sup>c</sup>	P,I
Darlington	CL,LL	CL	CL	No schedule	No standard,Varies <sup>e</sup>	L,P,0 <sup>h</sup>
Georgetown	CL,FS	CL	CL	30	3	0 <sup>h</sup> ,None <sup>n</sup>
Newberry	LL	CL	CL	30	Varies,1 <sup>e</sup>	H,P
Orangeburg	LL	CL	CL	30	3,No standard <sup>e</sup>	0 <sup>h</sup> ,P
Richland	CL,LL	CL	CL	30	3	0 <sup>h</sup> ,p <sup>n</sup>
South Dakota	LD	CD	CD	30	Varies <sup>e</sup>	P
Bennett	**					
Davison	**					
Tennessee	LL	FL	AL	30	4	None
Davidson	LL	FL,CL	CL	30	Varies	None
Sumner	FD,CD	AL,FD	AL	30	Varies	L

TABLE A.12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud		Nonfraud			
	Court- Established	Other				
Texas	LL	FL	AL,CL	30	Varies <sup>C</sup>	None
* Bexar						
DeWitt	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
* Harris						
Smith	FS	DK	AL	30 <sup>k</sup>	DK,Varies <sup>e</sup>	None
Tarrant	FS	FS	RD	30	Varies	L,P
Utah	CS	CS	CS	30	3	B,P
Region 2B	**					
Region 7A	**					
Vermont	LS	FS	AL	30	4,3,1 <sup>f</sup>	B
Hartford	**					
St. Albans	**					
Virginia	CL,FL	NA <sup>t</sup>	AL	30	1,1,No standard <sup>f</sup>	P
Charlotte	FL	FL	AL	No schedule,30 <sup>e</sup>	No standard,30 <sup>e</sup>	L
Hampton IC	CL	CL	CL	30	3	L,0 <sup>h</sup>
Norfolk IC	LL	FL	AL,CL	0 <sup>o</sup> ,30 <sup>e</sup>	2,3 <sup>e</sup>	L,P,0 <sup>o</sup>
* Portsmouth						
Pulaski	FL	FL	AL	30	No standard	L
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	LD	CD	CD	30	3	None
Washington	LS	CS	AL	30	4	P
Benton	NA <sup>r</sup>					
King-Rainier	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Pierce	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Spokane	NA <sup>r</sup>					
Vancouver	NA <sup>r</sup>					

TABLE A.12 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Arranging for Payment of the Claim (Q7.00)			Frequency with Which Follow-up Demand Letters Are Mailed (Days) (Q7.03)	Minimum Number of Demand Letters To Be Mailed (Q7.05)	Methods (Other Than Demand Letters) Used to Notify Household of a Claim (Q8.00)
	Fraud		Nonfraud			
	Court- Established	Other				
West Virginia	LS	CS	CS	No schedule	4	P
Beckley	**					
Charleston	**					
Wisconsin	LL	NA <sup>t</sup>	AL	30	3	None
Bayfield	AL	AL	AL	No schedule	No standard	L
Douglas	LL	NA <sup>t</sup>	AL	No schedule, 60 <sup>e</sup>	Varies	None, L <sup>e</sup>
Milwaukee	NA <sup>u</sup>	CL	CL	30	Varies	L
Rock	LL	FL, LL	FL	No schedule, 30 <sup>e</sup>	1, 1, 5 <sup>f</sup>	B, L
Sauk	LL	AL	AL	30	No standard	0 <sup>h</sup> , None <sup>n</sup>
Wyoming	LL	AL, CS	AL	No schedule	Varies <sup>c</sup>	None
Carbon	AL	AL	AL	No schedule	Varies	None
Crook	LL	AL	AL	No schedule	No standard	L
Freemont	AL, CS	AL, CS	AL, CS	No schedule	No standard	H
Natrona	CS	AL	AL	No schedule	NA	L
Park	AL	AL	AL	30	Varies	L

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in the interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSP system.

OK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. The respondent refused to answer the question.

TABLE A.12 (continued)

KEYS: Functional Level: A = Agency  
 C = Claims/Collections Unit  
 F = Fraud/Investigation Unit  
 L = Legal Authority  
 O = Other

Methods: B = Billing notice  
 L = Late payment letter  
 P = Phone calls  
 H = Home visit  
 I = In-office interview  
 O = Other

For each of the above,  
 code whether it is:  
 L = Local/County  
 D = District/Region  
 S = State

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>This refers to a claims worker in the local office rather than a special claims unit.

<sup>c</sup>Depends on the dollar value of the claim.

<sup>d</sup>This refers to claims due to agency error only; there is no standard for claims due to household error or fraud claims.

<sup>e</sup>The first figure refers to fraud claims, the second figure to nonfraud claims.

<sup>f</sup>The first figure refers to fraud claims, the second figure to claims due to household error, and the third figure to claims due to agency error.

<sup>g</sup>No demand letters are mailed for fraud claims.

<sup>h</sup>Parole board/probation office notified.

<sup>i</sup>This refers to all but court-established fraud.

<sup>j</sup>This refers to court-established fraud only.

<sup>k</sup>The first figure refers to nonfraud claims, the second and third figures to fraud claims.

<sup>l</sup>This refers to fraud claims and nonfraud claims due to household error; there is no standard for claims due to agency error.

<sup>m</sup>This refers to non-court-established fraud claims and nonfraud due to household error only; respondent did not know about court-established fraud claims or claims due to agency error.

<sup>n</sup>The first figure refers to court-established fraud claims, the second figure to all other claims.

<sup>o</sup>After two missed payments.

<sup>p</sup>Letter seeking explanation for late payments.

<sup>q</sup>Summons to court.

<sup>r</sup>State-level responsibility.

<sup>s</sup>Cases of suspected fraud are so rare they have never been pursued in this local FSA.

<sup>t</sup>All fraud cases are prosecuted only.

<sup>u</sup>Prosecution is not used to establish fraud claims.

TABLE A.13

ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS USED TO PURSUE DELINQUENT CLAIMS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Alternative Collection Methods Are Used (Q8.01)	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (Q8.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (Q8.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (Q8.02)
		Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
Alabama	No											
Bibb	No											
Etowah	No											
Franklin	Yes <sup>g</sup>		X								No policy	LS
Mobile	No											
Morgan	No											
Alaska	Yes									X <sup>c</sup>	No policy	CS,FS
Anchorage-Muldoon	**											
Ketchikan	**											
Arizona	Yes	3	2	X			X	1			No policy	CS
Maricopa	**											
Navajo	**											
Arkansas	Yes	1	2	3							D,0 <sup>i</sup>	CS,FS
Clay	**											
Phillips	**											
*California												
Los Angeles	Yes									X <sup>1</sup>	I,0 <sup>p</sup>	CL
San Bernardino	Yes									X <sup>1</sup>	P,F	CL,OL <sup>1</sup>
San Joaquin	Yes	4	2	3	1							CL
* Sonoma												
* Yolo												



TABLE A. 13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative Collection Methods Are Used (08.01)	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (08.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (08.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (08.02)
		Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
Colorado	Yes		1	2							No policy	CL
Boulder	Yes				2			1			D	CL
Denver	Yes		2					1			F,D	FL
Gunnison-Hinsdale	No											
* Mesa												
Pueblo	No											
Connecticut	Yes		3		2		4	1			No policy	CD,CS,LS
* New Haven												
* Torrington												
Delaware	Yes <sup>g</sup>	1	2							3 <sup>d</sup>	F,L,I	CS,LS
New Castle	**											
Sussex	**											
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes									x <sup>e</sup>	F,L,I,D	CS
Florida	Yes							X			No policy	Automated
Dade	**											
Polk	**											
Georgia	Yes	X									All cases pursued	Automated
Bibb	Yes	X									F,0 <sup>o</sup>	Automated
Colquitt	Yes	X									F,L,I,D	Automated
Fulton	Yes	X									P,D	Automated
Madison	Yes	X									No policy	Automated
* Peach												
Guam <sup>a</sup>	No											
Hawaii	No											
Honolulu	**											
Maui	**											

TABLE A.13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative Collection Methods Are Used (08.01)	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (08.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (08.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (08.02)
		Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
Idaho	Yes			1	2						No policy	CD
* Ada												
* Bonneville												
* Canyon												
* Owyhee												
* Shoshone												
Illinois	Yes	2	4			1				3 <sup>e</sup>	I	CS
Cook Co. (Ashland)	No											
Cook Co. (Englewood)	No											
Cook Co. (Garfield)	No											
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	No											
Greene	No											
Indiana	Yes	1	3		2						F,E,D	AL
Adams	No											
Allen	No											
Marion	Yes		1		2						F,L,I	CL,AL,OL <sup>m</sup>
Scott	No											
Wayne	Yes				X						F,L,D,O <sup>j</sup>	CL
Iowa	Yes	4	3	2	1						I,D	CS
Iowa	**											
Webster	**											
Kansas	Yes	1	2								No policy	AS,FD
Cherokee	No											
Franklin	No											
Linn	No											
Wichita	Yes	2	1					4	3		F,L	LL
Wyandotte	Yes	5	2				6	1	4	3 <sup>g</sup>	No policy	LL

TABLE A. 13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative Collection Methods Are Used (Q8.01)	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (Q8.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (Q8.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (Q8.02)
		Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
Kentucky	Yes					X					F,L,D	AL,CS
Bell	No											
Carter	No											
Hart	No											
Jefferson	No											
Todd	No											
Louisiana	Yes		1	2							F,L,D,O <sup>j</sup>	AS,CS
Caddo	No											
Lincoln	No											
Orleans	No											
St. Tammany	No											
Tangipahoa	No											
Maine	No										No policy	
Augusta	No											
Lewiston	No											
Maryland	Yes				2					1 <sup>e</sup>	All cases pursued	FL <sup>1</sup>
Allegany	No											
Baltimore City	No											
Baltimore County	Yes				X						L	CL,OL <sup>n</sup>
Frederick	Yes									X <sup>e</sup>	F,L,I,D	AL,OL <sup>n</sup>
Montgomery	Yes									X <sup>e</sup>	L	CL
Massachusetts	Yes	X									No policy	CS
Malden	No											
Roslindale	No											

TABLE A.13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (Q8.01)										Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (Q8.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (Q8.02)	
	Collection	Tax	Wage	Property	Small	Private	Credit	Civil	Garnish Bank					
	Are Used (Q8.01)	Refund Intercept	Garnish- ment	Liens	Claims Court	Collection Agency	Bureau	Actions	Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other				
Michigan	Yes	X										All cases pursued	CS	
Berrien	Yes	X										F,I,O <sup>r</sup>	Automated	
Branch	Yes	X										I,O <sup>q</sup>	Automated	
Macomb	Yes	X										No policy	Automated	
St. Clair	Yes	X										No policy	Automated	
Wayne	Yes	X										D	Automated	
Minnesota	Yes	3				1		2				No policy	AL	
Clay	Yes	2							3	4		1 <sup>o</sup>	No policy	CL
Dakota	No													
Hennepin	Yes											X <sup>m</sup>	I,D	AL
Ramsey	Yes	X											No policy	LL
Waseca	No													
Mississippi	No													
Attala	No													
Hinds	Yes								X				DK	AS
Lowndes	No													
Madison	No													
Tishomingo	No													
Missouri	Yes <sup>9</sup>	2		1		3							F	FD,LD
Buchanan	No													
Jackson	No													
Lafayette	No													
Pettis	No													
St. Louis	No													
Montana	Yes	1							2				No policy	
Cascade	No													
Lewis & Clark	No													

TABLE A.13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (QB.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (QB.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (QB.02)
	Collection	Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
	Methods											
	Are Used (QB.01)											
Nebraska	No											CS
Grand Island	No											
Lexington	No											
Lincoln	No											
Omaha	No											
Seward	No											
Nevada	Yes		2	3	1						F,E,L,I,D,O <sup>j</sup>	CL
Clark	**											
Washoe	**											
New Hampshire	Yes <sup>g</sup>		1	2							P,F,L,D	FS
Dover	**											
Keene	**											
New Jersey	Yes	X									No policy	CL
Burlington	Yes	1	5	2	2			2			L,D	CL
Camden	Yes	X									L,D	CL
Essex	Yes	1			2						No policy	CL
Hudson	Yes	X									L	CL
Middlesex	Yes	1		2	3						L,I,D	CL,FL
New Mexico	No											
Bernalillo	No											
Cibola	No											
New York	Yes <sup>g</sup>									X <sup>c</sup>	F	LS <sup>g</sup>
* Broome												
Cortland	No											
Erie	Yes		2	3				1	4		No policy	CL
New York City	No											
* Onondaga												

TABLE A. 13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative Collection Methods Are Used (Q8.01)	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (Q8.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (Q8.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (Q8.02)
		Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
North Carolina	Yes				X						No policy	AL
Craven	Yes				X						No policy	CL
Forsyth	No											
Halifax	No											
Haywood	Yes				X						No policy	CL,AL
Yancey	No											
*North Dakota												
Cass	No											
Emmons	No											
Grand Forks	No											
Mountrail	No											
Stutsman	No											
Ohio	Yes			2	1						P,F,D	CL
Cuyahoga	No											
Delaware	No											
Franklin	No											
Mahoning	Yes		1		2						D	CL
Richland	No											
Oklahoma	No											
Carter	No											
Custer	No											
Oregon	Yes	1	3	5	4			2 <sup>c</sup>			F,L,D,D <sup>j</sup>	CS
Albany	No											
Cottage Grove	No											
East Portland	No											
Springfield	No											
West Eugene	No											

TABLE A. 13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative Collection Methods Are Used (QB.01)	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (QB.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (QB.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (QB.02)
		Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
Pennsylvania	Yes					X					No policy	CS
Lycoming	No											
Philadelphia (Center)	No											
Philadelphia (Dgontz)	No											
Philadelphia (West)	No											
Westmoreland	No											
Rhode Island	No											
Providence	**											
Warwick	**											
South Carolina	Yes				X						D	CL
Darlington	No											
Georgetown	No											
Newberry	No											
Orangeburg	No											
Richland	No											
South Dakota	Yes <sup>g</sup>				X						F,L,I,D	CO,CS
Bennett	**											
Davison	**											
Tennessee	No											
Davidson	No											
Sumner	No											
Texas	Yes					X					L,I,O <sup>k</sup>	CS
* Bexar												
DeWitt	Ref.											
* Harris												
Smith	Yes					X					DK	AS
Tarrant	No											

TABLE A. 13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative Collection Methods Are Used (Q8.01)	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (Q8.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (Q8.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (Q8.02)
		Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
Utah	Yes	1	6	4	5	7	2		3		F,E,L,I,D	CL
Region 2B	**											
Region 7A	**											
Vermont	No											
Hartford	**											
St. Albans	**											
Virginia	No											
Charlotte	Yes			X							No policy	FL
Hampton IC	No											
Norfolk IC	Yes				1			2			F,L,I,D	FL
* Portsmouth												
Pulaski	No											
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	No											
Washington	Yes		2	1			3				L,I	CS
Benton	No											
King-Rainier	No											
Pierce	No											
Spokane	No											
Vancouver	No											
West Virginia	Yes		2	3	1						F,I,D	CS
Beckley	**											
Charleston	**											
Wisconsin	No											
Bayfield	No											
Douglas	No											
Milwaukee	No											
Rock	No											
Sauk	No											



TABLE A.13 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Alternative Collection Methods Are Used (QB.01)	Ranking of Alternative Collection Methods Used (QB.01)									Characteristics of Case That Increase the Likeli- hood of Pursuit through Alternative Methods (QB.04)	Functional Level of Staff Responsible for Initiating Alternative Collection Methods (QB.02)
		Tax Refund Intercept	Wage Garnish- ment	Property Liens	Small Claims Court	Private Collection Agency	Credit Bureau	Civil Actions	Garnish Bank Accounts <sup>b</sup>	Other		
Wyoming	Yes				2		1	3			No policy	CS
Carbon	No											
Crook	Yes									x <sup>n</sup>	No policy	AL
Freemont	Yes		X		X						No policy	AL,CS
Natrona	No											
Park	No											

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSP system.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. The respondent refused to answer the question.

KEY: Ranking: 1-8 = Ranking of method

X = Method used, but not ranked  
or only method that was used

Characteristics: D = Dollar amount

I = Inactive case

L = Long-term delinquency

E = Older error/claim

P = PA household

F = Fraud claim

O = Other

Functional Level: A = Agency

C = Claims/Collections Unit

F = Fraud/Investigation Unit

L = Legal Authority

O = Other

For each of the above, code  
whether it is:

L = Local/County

D = District/Region

S = State

TABLE A.13 (continued)

- <sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.
- <sup>b</sup>This method was not included as an alternative in the census instruments, but appeared so often as response to the census that it was included as an alternative in the survey instruments.
- <sup>c</sup>Oil revenue intercept.
- <sup>d</sup>Requirement that individual work off the value of the claim through a public job.
- <sup>e</sup>State collection agency.
- <sup>f</sup>Warrants issued by state comptroller to garnish circuit breakers (property tax relief for elderly), college grants, and/or paychecks.
- <sup>g</sup>The alternative methods are used for fraud claims only.
- <sup>h</sup>This refers to a fraud coordinator in the local office rather than a specialized fraud unit.
- <sup>i</sup>Error due to unreported income.
- <sup>j</sup>Household has resources/employed.
- <sup>k</sup>A non-adjudicated case.
- <sup>l</sup>County collection agency.
- <sup>m</sup>County parole and probation office.
- <sup>n</sup>Promissory note.
- <sup>o</sup>AFDC grant recoupment through integrated FSP/AFDC automated system.
- <sup>p</sup>Nonresponsive household.
- <sup>q</sup>Household error.

TABLE A.14

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROCESS FOR CLAIMS SUSPENSIONS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Suspension (Q9.07)		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (Q9.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
Alabama	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Bibb	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Etowah	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Franklin	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Mobile	Yes	CL, Automated	CL, Automated	Yes	No
Morgan	No <sup>d</sup>			No	No
Alaska	Yes	FS	CS	Yes	No
Anchorage-Huldon	**				
Ketchikan	**				
Arizona	Yes	CS	CS	No	No
Maricopa	**				
Navajo	**				
Arkansas	Yes	FS	CS	No	Yes
Clay	**				
Phillips	**				
*California					
Los Angeles	Yes	CL	CL	No	No
San Bernardino	Yes	CL <sup>f</sup>	CL, CL <sup>f</sup>	Yes	No
San Joaquin	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
* Sonoma					
* Yolo					

TABLE A. 14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Suspension (09.07)		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (09.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (09.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
Colorado	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Boulder	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Denver	Yes			No	No
Gunnison-Hinsdale	Yes	AL	AL	No	No
* Mesa					
Pueblo	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Connecticut	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
New Haven	**				
Torrington	**				
Delaware	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
New Castle	**				
Sussex	**				
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>		CS	Yes	No
Florida	Yes	CD	CD	Yes	Yes
Dade	**				
Polk	**				
Georgia	No <sup>h</sup>				
Bibb	No				
Colquitt	No				
Fulton	No				
Madison	No				
* Peach					
Guam <sup>a</sup>	Yes	FS	FS	Yes	No

TABLE A.14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Suspension (09.07)		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (09.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (09.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
Hawaii	No				
Honolulu	**				
Mau	**				
Idaho	Yes	CD	CD	Yes	No
* Ada					
* Bonneville					
* Canyon					
* Owyhee					
* Shoshone					
Illinois	Yes	CS	CS	No	Yes
Cook Co. (Ashland)	No				
Cook Co. (Englewood)	No				
Cook Co. (Garfield)	No				
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	No				
Greene	No				
Indiana	Yes	AL	AL	No	No
Adams	Yes	MA <sup>9</sup>	AL	No	Yes
Allen	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Marion	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Scott	Yes	AL	AL	No	Yes
Wayne	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Iowa	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Iowa	**				
Webster	**				

TABLE A.14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Suspension (Q9.07)		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (Q9.01)		Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud			
Kansas	Yes	Automated	Automated	No		Yes
Cherokee	No					
Franklin	No					
Linn	No					
Wichita	No					
Wyandotte	No					
Kentucky	Yes	CS	CS	Yes		No
Bell	No					
Carter	No					
Hart	No					
Jefferson	No					
Todd	No					
Louisiana	Yes	FS	CS	Yes		No
Caddo	No					
Lincoln	No					
Orleans	No					
St. Tammany	No					
Tangipahoa	No					
Maine	Yes	FS	AL	No		Yes <sup>C</sup>
Augusta	Yes	AL, Automated	AL, Automated	No		No
Lewiston	Yes	FS	AL	No		No
Maryland	Yes	AL	AL	Yes		Yes
Allegany	Yes	AL	AL	Yes		Yes
Baltimore City	Yes	CL	CL, FL	Yes		DK
Baltimore County	Yes	CL	CL	Yes		No
Frederick	Yes	AL	AL	Yes		Yes
Montgomery	Yes	CL	CL	Yes		No

TABLE A.14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Suspension (Q9.07)		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (Q9.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
Massachusetts	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Malden	No				
Roslindale	No				
Michigan	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Berrien	Yes	AL,CL	AL,CL	Yes	No
Branch	Yes	AS,Automated	AS,Automated	DK	No
Macomb	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	Yes
St. Clair	Yes	Automated	Automated	DK	DK
Wayne	Yes	LS,FS	AL,CL	Yes	Yes <sup>c</sup>
Minnesota	Yes	AL,CL	AL,CL	Yes	Yes
Clay	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Dakota	Yes	AL	AL	No	No
Hennepin	Yes	OL <sup>f</sup> ,Automated	OL <sup>f</sup> ,Automated	Yes	No
Ramsey	Yes	RL	RL	No	No
Waseca	Yes	NA	AL	Yes	No
Mississippi	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Attala	No				
Hinds	No				
Lowndes	No				
Madison	No				
Tishomingo	No				
Missouri	Yes	Automated	Automated	Yes	No
Buchanan	Yes	AL,AS	AL,AS	Yes	No
Jackson	No				
Lafayette	No				
Pettis	No				
St. Louis	No				

TABLE A.14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Suspension (09.07)		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (09.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (09.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
Montana	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Cascade	No				
Lewis & Clark	No				
Nebraska	Yes	AS	AS	Yes	No
Grand Island	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	Yes
Lexington	Yes	AS	AS	Yes	No
Lincoln	Yes	AS	AS	Yes	No
Omaha	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Seward	Yes	DK	AL, Automated	Yes	Yes <sup>e</sup>
Nevada	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	Yes
Clark	**				
Washoe	**				
New Hampshire	No				
Dover	**				
Keene	**				
New Jersey	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Burlington	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Camden	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Essex	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Hudson	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Middlesex	Yes <sup>c</sup>	NA	CL	Yes	No
New Mexico	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Bernalillo	No				
Cibola	No				



TABLE A.14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for <u>Claims Suspension (Q9.07)</u>		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (Q9.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
New York	Yes	AL,CL,FL	AL,CL,FL	Yes	Yes
* Broome					
Cortland	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Erle	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
New York City	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
* Onondaga					
North Carolina	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Craven	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Forsyth	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Halifax	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Haywood	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Yancey	Yes	Automated	Automated	Yes	No
*North Dakota					
Cass	Yes	AL	AL	No	No
Emmons	Yes	AL,LS	AL	Yes	No
Grand Forks	Yes	AL	AL	No	Yes
Mountrail	Yes	AL	AL	No	No
Stutsman	Yes	AL	AL	No	No
Ohio	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Cuyahoga	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Delaware	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Franklin	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Mahoning	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Richland	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Oklahoma	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Carter	**				
Custer	**				

TABLE A. 14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for <u>Claims Suspension (Q9.07)</u>		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (Q9.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
Oregon	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Albany	No				
Cottage Grove	No				
East Portland	No				
Springfield	No				
West Eugene	No				
Pennsylvania	Yes	AS	AS	Yes	No
Lycoming	No				
Philadelphia (Center)	No				
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	No				
Philadelphia (West)	No				
Westmoreland	No				
Rhode Island	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	No
Providence	**				
Warwick	**				
South Carolina	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Darlington	Yes	CL	CL	No	Yes
Georgetown	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Newberry	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Orangeburg	Yes	CL	CL	No	No
Richland	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
South Dakota	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	Yes
Bennett	**				
Davison	**				
Tennessee	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	Yes
Davidson	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	No
Sumner	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	Yes

TABLE A.14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Suspension (Q9.07)		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (Q9.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
Texas	Yes	CS	AL, CL	No	No
* Bexar					
DeWitt	Ref.				
* Harris					
Smith	Yes	FS	AL	Yes	Yes <sup>e</sup>
Tarrant	Yes	FD	CD	DK	DK
Utah	Yes	CL	CL	No	Yes
Region 2B	**				
Region 7A	**				
Vermont	Yes	AL	AL	No	Yes
Hartford	**				
St. Albans	**				
Virginia	Yes	CL, FL	CL, FL	Yes	Yes
Charlotte	Yes	AL	AL	No	No
Hampton IC	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Norfolk IC	Yes	FL	AL	Yes	Yes
* Portsmouth					
Pulaski	Yes	FL	AL	Yes	No
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	No				
Washington	Yes	CS	CS	Yes	Yes
Benton	No				
King-Rainier	No				
Pierce	No				
Spokane	No				
Vancouver	No				
West Virginia	Yes	CS	CS	No	No
Beckley	**				
Charleston	**				

TABLE A.14 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Suspended within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Suspension (Q9.07)		Existence of a Claims Review Process To Determine Which Claims Are Eligible for Suspension (Q9.01)	Claims Suspension Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
		Fraud	Nonfraud		
Wisconsin	Yes	AL	AL	DK	Yes
Bayfield	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Douglas	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Milwaukee	Yes	CL	CL	Yes	Yes
Rock	Yes	FL	FL	Yes	No
Sauk	Yes	AL	AL	Yes	No
Wyoming	Yes <sup>d</sup>	CS	CS	No	No
Carbon	No				
Crook	Yes	AL,CS	AL,CS	Yes	Yes
Freemont	Yes	AL,CS	AL,CS	Yes	Yes
Natrona	No				
Park	No				

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in the interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSP system.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. The respondent refused to answer the question.

KEY: Functional Level: A = Agency  
C = Claims/Collections Unit  
F = Fraud/Investigation Unit  
O = Other

For each of the above, code  
whether it is:

L = Local/County  
D = District/Region  
S = State

TABLE A. 14 (continued)

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>Fraud claims are not suspended.

<sup>c</sup>This response is for fraud claims only.

<sup>d</sup>Claims suspension is very seldom used.

<sup>e</sup>This response is for nonfraud only.

<sup>f</sup>The county collection agency.

<sup>g</sup>Cases of suspected fraud have never been purged in this local FSA.

<sup>h</sup>Based on local FSA survey responses, this entry is changed from "yes" to "no" to reflect a clearer understanding of the pre-termination process. Georgia regulations forbid suspensions in the strict definition of the word; however, there is a period of 5 years (for nonfraud cases) to 10 years (for fraud cases) during which established claims are kept active prior to termination.

TABLE A.15

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROCESS FOR CLAIMS TERMINATION, BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Alabama	Yes	Automated	6	N	No
Bibb	Yes	AL	3	S	No
Etowah	Yes	AL, Automated	3		No
Franklin	Yes	AS	Indefinitely	C, L	Yes
Mobile	Yes	CL, Automated	Indefinitely	S, C	No
Morgan	Yes	AL	NA <sup>f</sup>	S <sup>e</sup>	No
Alaska	Yes	CS, FS	3		No
Anchorage-Muldoon	**				
Ketchikan	**				
Arizona	Yes	CS	Indefinitely	L	No
Maricopa	**				
Navajo	**				
Arkansas	No		Indefinitely	L	
Clay	**				
Phillips	**				
*California					
Los Angeles	Yes <sup>g</sup>	CL	3	S	No
San Bernardino	Yes <sup>h</sup>	CL <sup>i</sup>	3		No
San Joaquin	Yes	CL	3		No
* Sonoma					
* Yolo					

TABLE A. 15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Colorado	Yes	CL	3		Yes
Boulder	Yes <sup>f</sup>	CL	6,3 <sup>c</sup>	C	Yes
Denver	Yes	CL	3		No
Gunnison-Hinsdale	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	DK	No
* Mesa					
Pueblo	Yes	CL	3		No
Connecticut	Yes	CS	3		No
* New Haven					
* Torrington					
Delaware	Yes	CS	Indefinitely,3 <sup>c</sup>	C	No
New Castle	**				
Sussex	**				
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes	CS	3		No
Florida	Yes	CD	> 3	S	Yes
Dade	**				
Polk	**				
Georgia	Yes	Automated	10,5 <sup>c</sup>	L	No
Bibb	No				
Colquitt	No				
Fulton	Yes	Automated	NA <sup>e</sup>	NA	Yes
Madison	Yes	AL	NA <sup>e</sup>	R <sup>b</sup>	Yes
* Peach					
Guam <sup>a</sup>	Yes	FS	3		No
Hawaii	No				
Honolulu	**				
Maui	**				

TABLE A.15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Idaho	Yes	CD	3		No
* Ada					
* Bonneville					
* Canyon					
* Owyhee					
* Shoshone					
Illinois	Yes	CS	Indefinitely	C	Yes
Cook Co. (Ashland)	No				
Cook Co. (Englewood)	No				
Cook Co. (Garfield)	No				
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	No				
Greene	No				
Indiana	Yes	AL	Indefinitely, <sup>3c</sup>	C	No
Adams	Yes <sup>9</sup>	AL	Indefinitely	C,R	Yes <sup>9</sup>
Allen	Yes	CL	3		No
Marion	Yes	CL	3		No
Scott	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	L,C	No
Wayne	Yes	CL, Automated	3	C	No
Iowa	Yes	CS	4	L	No
Iowa	**				
Webster	**				
Kansas	Yes	AS	5	C	Yes
Cherokee	No				
Franklin	No				
Linn	No				
Wichita	No				
Wyandotte	No				



TABLE A.15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Kentucky	Yes	CS	Indefinitely	S	No
Bell	No				
Carter	No				
Hart	No				
Jefferson	No				
Todd	No				
Louisiana	Yes	Automated	3		No
Caddo	No				
Lincoln	No				
Orleans	No				
St. Tammany	No				
Tangipahoa	No				
Maine	Yes	CS	3		No
Augusta	Yes	AL, Automated	3		No
Lewiston	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	C	No
Maryland	Yes	AL	3		Yes
Allegany	Yes	AL	3		No
Baltimore City	Yes	CL	3		DK
Baltimore County	Yes	CL	Indefinitely	L	No
Frederick	No		Indefinitely	C	No
Montgomery	Yes	CL	DK	DK	No
Massachusetts	Yes	CS	3		Yes
Malden	No				
Roslindale	No				

TABLE A.15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Michigan	Yes	CL	3		No
Berrien	Yes	AL,CL	3		No
Branch	Yes	Automated,AS	3		No
Macomb	Yes	AL,CL	Indefinitely	R	Yes
St. Clair	DK				
Wayne	Yes	CL,FL,FS	3		Yes <sup>h</sup>
Minnesota	Yes	AS	3		Yes
Clay	Yes	CL	3		Yes
Dakota	Yes	Automated	Indefinitely	L	No
Hennepin	Yes	AS	1	0 <sup>j</sup>	No
Ramsey	Yes	CL	3		No
Waseca	Yes <sup>g</sup>	AL	3		No
Mississippi	Yes	CS	3		No
Attala	No				
Hinds	No				
Louides	No				
Madison	No				
Tishomingo	No				
Missouri	Yes	Automated	3		No
Buchanan	Yes	AL,FS	3		Yes
Jackson	No				
Lafayette	No				
Pettis	No				
St. Louis	No				
Montana	Yes	CS	3		No
Cascade	No				
Lewis & Clark	No				

TABLE A.15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Nebraska	Yes	AS	6	C	No
Grand Island	Yes	AL, AS	3		Yes
Lexington	Yes	AL, AS	6	R	No
Lincoln	Yes	AS	6	R	No
Omaha	Yes	CL	3		Yes
Seward	Yes	DK, AL <sup>C</sup>	3		DK, Yes <sup>C</sup>
Nevada	Yes	CL	3		Yes
Clark	**				
Washoe	**				
New Hampshire	No <sup>E</sup>				
Dover	**				
Keene	**				
New Jersey	Yes	CL	> 3 <sup>d</sup>	N	Yes
Burlington	Yes	CL	Indefinitely	C	No
Camden	Yes	CL	Indefinitely	L, C	No
Essex	Yes	CL	3		No
Hudson	Yes	CL	3		No
Middlesex	Yes <sup>9</sup>	CL	Indefinitely	L	No
New Mexico	Yes	Automated	3		No
Bernalillo	No				
Cibola	No				
New York	Yes	AL, CL, FL	> 3 <sup>d3</sup>	N	Yes
* Broome					
Cortland	Yes	CL	3		No
Erie	Yes	FL, CL <sup>C</sup>	Indefinitely	L, C, R	Yes
New York City	Yes	CL	3		No
* Onondaga					

TABLE A. 15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (09.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (09.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (09.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (09.18)
North Carolina	Yes	Automated	3		No
Craven	Yes	Automated	3		No
Forsyth	Yes	Automated	3		No
Halifax	Yes	CL	3		Yes
Haywood	No				
Yancey	Yes	AL, Automated	Indefinitely	L, C	No
*North Dakota					
Cass	Yes	AL	3		No
Emmons	Yes	AL	3		No
Grand Forks	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	DK	Yes
Mountrail	Yes	AL	3		No
Stutsman	Yes	AL	3		No
Ohio	Yes	CS	3		Yes
Cuyahoga	Yes	CL	Indefinitely	L	No
Delaware	Yes	AL	3		No
Franklin	Yes	CL	3		Yes
Mahoning	Yes	CL	Indefinitely	L, C	No
Richland	Yes	AL	3		No
Oklahoma	Yes	CS	3		No
Carters	**				
Custer	**				
Oregon	Yes	Automated	3		Yes
Albany	No				
Cottage Grove	No				
East Portland	No				
Springfield	No				
West Eugene	No				

TABLE A.15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Pennsylvania	Yes	Automated	3		No
Lycoming	No				
Philadelphia (Center)	No				
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	No				
Philadelphia (West)	No				
Westmoreland	No				
Rhode Island	Yes	CS	3		No
Providence	**				
Warwick	**				
South Carolina	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	L	Yes
Darlington	Yes	LL,CL <sup>C</sup>	3		Yes
Georgetown	Yes	CL	3		No
Newberry	Yes	CL	3		Yes
Orangeburg	Yes	CL	Indefinitely	R	No
Richland	Yes	CL	3		Yes
South Dakota	Yes	CS	3		Yes
Bennett	**				
Davison	**				
Tennessee	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	L	Yes
Davidson	Yes <sup>9</sup>	CL	3		Yes
Sumner	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	C	Yes
Texas	Yes	Automated	5	C	No
* Bexar					
DeWitt	Ref.				
* Harris					
Smith	Yes	AL,FS	Indefinitely,DK <sup>C</sup>	C	Yes <sup>9</sup>
Tarrant	DK				

TABLE A. 15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Utah	Yes	CL	3		Yes
Region 2B	**				
Region 7A	**				
Vermont	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	A	Yes
Hartford	**				
St. Albans	**				
Virginia	Yes	AS	3		No
Charlotte	Yes	AL,FL	Indefinitely	C	No
Hampton IC	Yes	CL	Indefinitely <sup>h</sup>	O <sup>k</sup>	Yes
Norfolk IC	Yes	Automated	3		No
* Portsmouth					
Pulaski	Yes	AL,FL	3		No
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	No <sup>c</sup>				
Washington	Yes	CS	3		Yes
Benton	No				
King-Rainier	No				
Pierce	No				
Spokane	No				
Vancouver	No				
West Virginia	Yes	CS	Indefinitely	S	No
Beckley	**				
Charleston	**				
Wisconsin	Yes	Automated	3		Yes
Bayfield	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	C	No
Douglas	Yes	AL	3		No
Milwaukee	Yes <sup>g</sup>	CL	Indefinitely	O <sup>l</sup>	Yes
Rock	Yes	FL	Indefinitely	C,R	No
Sauk	Yes	AL	3		No

TABLE A.15 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Are Terminated Within This Jurisdiction	Functional Level of Responsibility for Claims Termination (Q9.13)	Length of Time Suspended Claim Is Carried on Books Prior to Termination (Years) (Q9.16)	Reasons for Carrying Suspended Claim on Books Beyond Required Three Years (Q9.17)	Claims Determination Decisions Are Reviewed by Higher-Level Staff (Q9.18)
Wyoming	Yes	CS	4	L	Yes
Carbon	No				
Crook	Yes	AL	Indefinitely	L	No
Freemont	No				
Natrona	No				
Park	No				

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in the interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSP system.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. The respondent refused to answer the question.

KEY: Functional Level: A = Agency

C = Claims/Collections Unit

F = Fraud/Investigations Unit

O = Other

For each of the above, code whether it is:

L = Local/County

D = District/Region

S = State

Reasons for Carrying:

A = Audit purposes

L = Legal restrictions

S = Shortage of staff/resources

C = Continued pursuit of claim

N = No specific reason

R = State requirements

O = Other

TABLE A.15 (continued)

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>This reason was not included in the census instruments but was listed by census respondents often enough to be included as an alternative in the survey instruments.

<sup>c</sup>See Table A.14 for details on the reasons for non-response.



TABLE A. 16

ROUGH PROFESSIONAL ESTIMATES OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS,  
BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
Alabama	Yes	S,L	50%	50%	70%	25%	50%
Bibb	Yes	S	90	80	5	75	50
Etowah	Yes	S	100	90	90	60	75
Franklin	Yes	P,O <sup>e</sup>	100	98	99	75	80
Mobile	Yes	S,L,P	50	50	30	10	90
Morgan	Yes	S	100	70	80	60	70
Alaska	Yes <sup>b</sup>	P	DK	DK	70	65	30
Anchorage-Muldoon	No						
Ketchikan	Yes	S,L,P,O <sup>d</sup>	100	100	75	65	65
Arizona	Yes	S	60	90	8	70	70
Maricopa	Yes	L	80	75	DK	DK	50
Navajo	No		80	80	DK	DK	DK
Arkansas	Yes	S,L	DK	DK	25	DK	60
Clay	Yes	S,L	90	80	80	95	DK
Phillips	Yes	S,P	60	50	70	75	25
*California							
Los Angeles	Yes	D,P	DK	DK	DK	21	85
San Bernardino	Yes	S	100	100	60	70	83
San Joaquin	Yes	S,O,P	100	90	50	90	50

\* Sonoma

\* Yolo

TABLE A. 16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
Colorado	Yes	S,D	95	90	60	17	20
Boulder	Yes	S	90	40	50	50	90
Denver	Yes <sup>b</sup>	L,D	DK	60	10	50	80
Gunnison-Hinsdale	No		100	100	50	66	50
* Mesa							
Pueblo	No		100	95	75	40	20
Connecticut	Yes	S,L	100	75	87	70	75
* New Haven							
* Torrington							
Delaware	Yes	S,L	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
New Castle	Yes	S,O <sup>e</sup>	DK	85	50	NA	NA
Sussex	No		80	75	25	DK	DK
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	Yes	P	33	98	60	65	52
Florida	Yes	S	DK	76	DK	DK	50
Dade	Yes	S	50	50	12	15	80
Polk	Yes	S,L,D,O <sup>f</sup>	85	70	30	25	75
Georgia	Yes	S	DK	68	58	27	DK
Bibb	Yes	S,L,O <sup>g</sup>	90	60	50	75	75
Colquitt	Yes	S,O <sup>h</sup>	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Fulton	Yes	S,L,O <sup>f</sup>	DK	DK	DK	25	DK
Madison	Yes <sup>c</sup>	L	95	95	75	75	25
* Peach							
Guam <sup>a</sup>	No		DK	DK	90	DK	50

TABLE A.16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
Hawaii	Yes	S,L	DK	60	60	75	67
Honolulu	Yes	S,L,D	95	100	1	20	50
Maui	Yes	L,D,P	90	90	90	NA	NA
Idaho	No		DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
* Ada							
* Bonnaville							
* Canyon							
* Owyhee							
* Shoshone							
Illinois	No		100	100	10	25	70
Cook Co. (Ashland)	Yes	P	100	DK	20	10	DK
Cook Co. (Englewood)	Yes	L	100	50	DK	DK	DK
Cook Co. (Garfield)	Yes	S,P,O <sup>i</sup>	99	95	DK	DK	DK
Cook Co. (S. Suburban)	Yes	S,D	98	98	DK	DK	DK
Greene	No		100	20	NA	NA	NA
Indiana	Yes	S,D	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Adams	No		100	100	NA	80	0
Allen	Yes <sup>b</sup>	P	100	97	85	75	87
Marion	Yes	S,L,D	85	90	80	20	60
Scott	Yes	S,L	100	100	100	60	50
Wayne	Yes <sup>b</sup>	S,P	99	99	10	50	50
Iowa	Yes	S	DK	DK	95	70	25
Iowa	Yes <sup>b</sup>	P	100	100	20	75	40
Webster	Yes	S,L,D,P	100	100	90	75	50

TABLE A. 16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.0B)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.0B)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
Kansas	Yes	S,L	50	90	95	70	80
Cherokee	Yes	S,L,D,P	100	100	50	70	95
Franklin	Yes	S,L	100	100	75	50	50
Linn	Yes	S,P	100	100	80	75	35
Wichita	Yes	S,L,D,P	40	95	95	90	10
Wyandotte	Yes	S,L,D,P,O <sup>2</sup>	95	85	85	80	DK
Kentucky	Yes	S,L,P	100	34	DK	70	50
Bell	Yes	S,L,D,P	100	75	36	95	DK
Carter	No		90	90	95	95	DK
Hart	Yes	S,L	100	75	35	75	25
Jefferson	Yes	L	100	80	50	80	DK
Todd	Yes	S,P	80	75	10	95	5
Louisiana	Yes	L	DK	99	95	75	DK
Caddo	Yes	S	50	95	30	70	20
Lincoln	Yes	L,D,P	50	45	30	40	70
Orleans	Yes	S,L,D,P	90	98	55	25	75
St. Tammany	Yes	S	90	90	50	30	75
Tangipahoa	No		97	90	40	50	35
Maine	Yes	S	DK	DK	20	DK	15
Augusta	Yes	S	100	100	20	75	10
Lewiston	Yes	S,L,P	75	80	75	60	10
Maryland	Yes	S,D	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Allegany	Yes	S,L,D	95	55	35	85	50
Baltimore City	Yes	S,D,P	100	95	15	50	50
Baltimore County	Yes	S	95	80	98	70	25
Frederick	No		100	100	80	50	30
Montgomery	Yes	L	100	DK	2	DK	DK

TABLE A. 16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
Massachusetts	Yes	P	90	90	98	60	50
Malden	No		95	DK	DK	DK	DK
Roslindale	No		DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Michigan	Yes	M	DK	DK	DK	70	DK
Berrien	Yes <sup>b</sup>	P	90	94	50	75	50
Branch	No		DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Macomb	Yes	L	65	65	30	60	30
St. Clair	Yes	S,L,D,P	95	95	15	75	60
Wayne	Yes <sup>b</sup>	P	75	100	50	95	5
Minnesota	Yes	S,L	99	100	99	20	DK
Clay	Yes	P	90	90	50	DK	DK
Dakota	Yes	S,L,D,P	90	100	75	75	75
Hennepin	Yes	S,L,P	DK	DK	DK	60	NA
Ramsey	Yes	S,L,P	80	95	1	75	30
Waseca	No		99	99	NA	85	5
Mississippi	Yes	S	DK	99	80	60	50
Attala	Yes	S,L,D,P	100	100	99	50	2
Hinds	No		100	98	99	50	50
Louises	Yes	S,D,P	45	DK	30	7	80
Madison	Yes	S	100	90	65	90	10
Tishomingo	Yes	S	90	99	90	50	50
Missouri	Yes	S,P	100	100	90	60	80
Buchanan	Yes	S	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Jackson	Yes	S	100	85	DK	NA	NA
Lafayette	Yes	S,L	90	85	10	DK	DK
Pettis	Yes	S	100	50	NA	NA	NA
St. Louis	Yes	S,D	100	25	DK	50	30

TABLE A.16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
Montana	Yes <sup>b</sup>	P	DK	100	10	60	40
Cascade	Yes	S,D	95	60	35	60	NA
Lewis & Clark	Yes	S,L,P	75	100	100	95	20
Nebraska	Yes	S	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Grand Island	Yes <sup>c</sup>	S	100	75	100	75	75
Lexington	Yes	L	95	95	DK	90	20
Lincoln	Yes	S,L	95	95	1	25	60
Omaha	Yes	S,L,D,P	75	95	20	40	75
Seward	No		90	95	0	80	30
Nevada	Yes	S,L	100	92	DK	70	30
Clark	Yes	S,L,P	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Washoe	Yes	S	100	75	25	25	50
New Hampshire	Yes	P	DK	60	60	50	60
Dover	No		100	75	75	75	25
Keene	NA		DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
New Jersey	Yes	S	92	98	33	66	73
Burlington	Yes	D,P	100	90	80	73	50
Camden	Yes	S	100	75	50	DK	DK
Essex	Yes	S	100	85	DK	80	35
Hudson	Yes	S,D	98	99	95	100	80
Middlesex	Yes	S,P,D <sup>k</sup>	100	85	25	65	75
New Mexico	Yes	S,L	100	100	83	40	40
Bernalillo	Yes	S	50	50	10	DK	DK
Cibola	Yes	S	DK	DK	DK	NA	NA

TABLE A.16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
New York	Yes	S	100	100	11	15	90
* Broome							
Cortland	Yes	S,D,P	85	85	100	50	50
Erie	Yes	S,D,P	98	80	25	85	40
New York City	Yes	S	100	95	95	65	20
* Onondaga							
North Carolina	Yes	N	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Craven	No		100	98	NA	95	20
Forsyth	Yes	S,O <sup>1</sup>	DK	50	DK	20	60
Halifax	Yes	S,D,P	90	85	50	90	30
Haywood	Yes	S	100	25	DK	75	30
Vancey	Yes	S,L	100	40	0	80	20
*North Dakota							
Cass	No		100	100	100	85	30
Emmons	No		100	95	95	95	5
Grand Forks	No		100	100	100	85	DK
Mountrail	No		100	73	90	95	4
Stutsman	No		100	100	5	80	10
Ohio	Yes	S	DK	DK	75	80	60
Cuyahoga	Yes	S,P,D	DK	40	35	50	20
Delaware	No		98	98	0	70	50
Franklin	Yes <sup>b</sup>	P	100	80	5	45	55
Mahoning	Yes	D,P,O <sup>m</sup>	95	90	75	47	95
Richland	Yes	S,D,P	100	100	1	30	70
Oklahoma	Yes	S,O	98	50	95	55	70
Carter	Yes	S,L,O	85	100	10	DK	DK
Custer	Yes	S	2	100	NA	NA	NA

TABLE A. 16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
Oregon	Yes	S	DK	DK	25	DK	25
Albany	No		65	80	5	60	DK
Cottage Grove	No		100	100	100	25	15
East Portland	Yes	S	80	80	5	75	DK
Springfield	Yes	S	90	100	50	70	40
West Eugene	No		75	90	35	85	55
Pennsylvania	Yes	R	DK	DK	12	DK	DK
Lycoming	Yes	S,L	99	DK	DK	DK	DK
Philadelphia (Center)	Yes	P,O <sup>e</sup>	100	DK	DK	DK	DK
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	Yes	O <sup>e</sup>	100	90	DK	DK	DK
Philadelphia (West)	DK		100	DK	DK	DK	DK
Westmoreland	No		100	DK	DK	DK	DK
Rhode Island	Yes	P	95	99	75	75	70
Providence	Yes	S	75	75	25	50	50
Warwick	No		10	1	1	1	1
South Carolina	Yes	S,L,R	85	85	30	85	50
Darlington	Yes <sup>b</sup>	D,P	100	95	75	75	90
Georgetown	No		98	98	2	80	20
Newberry	Yes	S	95	95	95	90	20
Orangeburg	Yes	S	75	80	85	70	30
Richland	Yes	S,P	90	50	70	DK	DK
South Dakota	Yes	N	DK	99	80	50	50
Bennett	Yes	L	60	100	80	DK	DK
Davison	Yes <sup>b</sup>	S,L,P,O <sup>n</sup>	95	98	85	42	3
Tennessee	Yes	S,L	45	100	DK	100	DK
Davidson	Yes	S	85	80	65	75	45
Sumner	Yes	S,L,P	80	75	25	15	90



TABLE A. 16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
Texas	No		DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
* Bexar							
DeWitt	Ref.		Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
* Harris							
Smith	Yes	S	99	95	50	80	30
Tarrant	Yes	S	99	99	75	60	40
Utah	Yes	S,R	DK	98	35	DK	80
Region 2B	Yes	S,L,P	10	95	90	95	95
Region 7A	No		95	DK	5	95	DK
Vermont	No		DK	100	90	40	DK
Hartford	No		100	98	50	28	22
St. Albans	Yes <sup>b</sup>	S	100	100	30	75	DK
Virginia	Yes	S,L	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Charlotte	Yes	S	100	85	90	85	40
Hampton IC	Yes	S	95	80	10	90	10
Norfolk IC	Yes	S,L,D,P	99	99	90	50	55
* Portsmouth							
Pulaski	Yes	S,P	85	30	2	65	80
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	Yes	N	DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Washington	Yes	L,P	DK	DK	87	70	30
Benton	Yes	S	90	75	95	85	30
King-Rainier	Yes	S,L,D,P	100	99	54	DK	DK
Pierce	Yes <sup>b</sup>	S,L	100	70	50	DK	DK
Spokane	DK		DK	DK	DK	DK	DK
Vancouver	Yes	S,L,D,P	95	70	80	DK	DK

TABLE A. 16 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Existence of a Backlog of Overissuances and Claims To Be Processed (Q10.08)	Reasons for the Backlog of Overissuances and Claims (Q10.08)	Professional Estimates of the Percentage of (Q10.06):				
			Identified Overissuances That Lead to Claims Referrals	Claims Referrals That Lead to Established Claims	Claims Referrals for Suspected Fraud That Lead to Established Fraud Claims	Established Claims for Which Some Collections Are Made	Established Claims That Eventually Become Delinquent
West Virginia	Yes	S,L	86	52	DK	DK	63
Beckley	Yes	S,P	100	90	37	74	DK
Charleston	Yes	S,D,O <sup>e</sup>	100	75	DK	60	40
Wisconsin	Yes	S,L	DK	DK	DK	75	DK
Bayfield	Yes	S	100	25	1	100	0
Douglas	No		100	99	100	DK	DK
Milwaukee	Yes	S	40	90	50	70	DK
Rock	Yes	S,O <sup>o</sup>	90	90	10	65	80
Sauk	No		100	75	10	75	50
Wyoming	Yes	R	98	98	90	33	DK
Carbon	Yes	S	100	75	50	100	NA
Crook	No		100	100	0	100	33
Freemont	Yes	S,D,P	100	100	40	60	50
Natrona	Yes	S,L,D,P	10	40	40	70	20
Park	Yes <sup>b</sup>	S	100	100	100	20	80

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This series of questions was not asked in the interviews with local FSAs in states where the claims process is predominantly state-operated.

NA Question not applicable to local office.

DK Information not available at time of interview.

Ref. Respondent refused to answer question.

TABLE A.16 (continued)

KEY: Reasons for backlog: S = Shortage of staff/resources  
 L = Claims are low priority  
 P = Process is slow for fraud cases  
 D = Lack of data processing capabilities  
 R = Limitations on recoupment/weak regulations  
 N = No specific reason given  
 O = Other

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>Backlog is of suspected fraud and fraud claims only.

<sup>c</sup>This response is for nonfraud claims only.

<sup>d</sup>There are no established procedures for following up backlogs.

<sup>e</sup>Backlog is due to a lack of information or difficulty in obtaining information.

<sup>f</sup>Agency error must be established, but, because clients don't pay, following up the backlog wastes time.

<sup>g</sup>Backlog is due to a lack of understanding of the claims process by staff.

<sup>h</sup>Backlog is due to high staff turnover.

<sup>i</sup>Backlog is due to cumbersome procedures for claims.

<sup>j</sup>Backlog is due to the high percentage of fraud cases.

<sup>k</sup>Backlog occurs when casefiles cannot be located.

<sup>l</sup>Backlog is due to poor administration by previous FSA officials.

<sup>m</sup>Backlog occurs because privacy laws restrict the availability of necessary information.

<sup>n</sup>Backlog occurs because the ADH is not within the FSP.

<sup>o</sup>Backlog is due to the conversion to an automated system.

TABLE A.17

ROUGH MEASURES OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CLAIMS  
COLLECTION PROCESS, BY STATE, FY 1985

Jurisdiction	Claims Established for Each \$100 of Issuance in Error (Dollars)	Claims Collected for Each \$100 of Claims Established (Dollars)	Claims Collected for for Each \$100 of Issuance in Error (Dollars)
Alabama	9.55	44.70	4.27
Alaska	18.95	32.30	6.12
Arizona	11.38	39.80	4.53
Arkansas	14.50	48.50	7.03
California	19.15	32.01	6.13
Colorado	10.95	29.99	3.28
Connecticut	15.98	31.59	5.05
Delaware	22.10	28.79	6.36
District of Columbia	11.00	17.31	1.90
Florida	14.64	35.64	5.22
Georgia	12.87	45.84	5.90
Guam	15.62	68.75	10.74
Hawaii	73.07	22.02	16.09
Idaho	11.72	57.21	6.71
Illinois	16.13	10.79	1.74
Indiana	9.56	38.35	3.67
Iowa	17.79	58.90	10.48
Kansas	16.99	39.86	6.77
Kentucky	6.04	48.73	2.94
Louisiana	4.67	40.59	1.90
Maine	16.23	41.97	6.81
Maryland	28.29	12.95	3.66
Massachusetts	15.20	37.97	5.77
Michigan	10.86	25.76	2.80
Minnesota	7.81	15.88	1.24
Mississippi	17.03	17.46	2.97
Missouri	26.42	32.74	8.65
Montana	8.90	51.93	4.62
Nebraska	16.37	36.05	5.90
Nevada	47.40	55.53	26.32

TABLE A.17 (continued)

Jurisdiction	Claims Established for Each \$100 of Issuance in Error (Dollars)	Claims Collected for Each \$100 of Claims Established (Dollars)	Claims Collected for for Each \$100 of Issuance in Error (Dollars)
New Hampshire	20.85	55.29	11.53
New Jersey	39.05	33.36	13.03
New Mexico	13.44	15.44	2.07
New York	8.58	28.94	2.48
North Carolina	16.98	59.06	10.03
North Dakota	17.34	52.08	9.03
Ohio	12.00	29.09	3.49
Oklahoma	7.08	44.15	3.12
Oregon	20.56	47.86	9.84
Pennsylvania	11.91	17.32	2.06
Rhode Island	12.81	14.60	1.87
South Carolina	11.84	63.18	7.48
South Dakota	20.53	58.21	11.95
Tennessee	17.82	35.52	6.33
Texas	12.54	43.39	5.44
Utah	18.90	41.16	7.78
Vermont	15.33	32.29	4.95
Virginia	13.37	54.41	7.28
Virgin Islands	10.39	30.71	3.19
Washington	23.40	22.93	5.36
West Virginia	8.27	48.37	4.00
Wisconsin	10.18	50.25	5.12
Wyoming	12.84	30.87	3.96
Median Value	14.64	37.97	5.36

SOURCE: FNS, State Tables of Activity Ranking, Plus (STAR+), April 1986.

## **APPENDIX B**

APPENDIX TABLE B.1

## SUMMARY OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF CLAIMS COLLECTION PROCESS, BY STATE AND LOCAL FSA

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
Alabama	0%	No	25%	100%	100%	67%	100%	No
Bibb	0	OK	25	0	40	33	100	No
Etowah	10	No	25	100	20	67	100	No
Franklin	10	Yes	25	100	60	100	100	Yes
Mobile	10	Yes	25	100	60	33	100	No
Morgan	10	No	75	0	80	67	100	No
Alaska	80	Yes	75	100	60	67	100	Yes
Anchorage-Huldoon	80	**	100	0	**	67	**	**
Ketchikan	80	**	100	100	**	67	**	**
Arizona	100	Yes	50	100	60	67	100	Yes
Maricopa	80	**	50	67	**	33	**	**
Navajo	80	**	75	100	**	67	**	**
Arkansas	80	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Clay	80	**	50	0	**	67	**	**
Phillips	100	**	0	0	**	33	**	**
*California								
Los Angeles	0	Yes	50	100	80	67	50	Yes
San Bernardino	0	Yes	0	67	60	33	50	Yes
San Joaquin	0	Yes	0	0	40	67	50	Yes
Sonoma								
Yolo								

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved In Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
Colorado	0	Yes	50	0	60	100	75	Yes
Boulder	0	Yes	25	0	80	67	50	Yes
Denver	0	Yes	0	0	60	67	50	Yes
Gunnison-Hinsdale	10	No	25	0	40	67	50	No
* Mesa								
Pueblo	0	Yes	75	100	60	100	50	No
Connecticut	100	Yes	75	67	80	67	100	Yes
* New Haven								
* Torrington								
Delaware	100	Yes	50	33	60	67	100	Yes
New Castle	100	**	50	33	**	33	**	**
Sussex	100	**	0	0	**	33	**	**
District of Columbia <sup>a</sup>	100	Yes	50	100	60	67	100	Yes
Florida	100	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Dade	40	**	75	0	**	100	**	**
Polk	10	**	100	100	**	100	**	**
Georgia	40	Yes	100	100	80	100	100	Yes
Bibb	40	Yes	100	100	100	100	100	Yes
Colquitt	30	Yes	75	100	80	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	Yes
Fulton	20	Yes	100	100	80	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	Yes
Madison	40	Yes	100	100	40	100	100	Yes
* Peach								



TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
Guam <sup>a</sup>	100	Yes	0	0	80	67	100	No
Hawaii	60	No	25	67	80	67	100	No
Honolulu	60	**	75	33	**	67	**	**
Maui	60	**	0	0	**	67	**	**
Idaho	70	Yes	0	0	60	67	75	Yes
* Ada								
* Bonneville								
* Canyon								
* Owyhee								
* Shoshone								
Illinois	100	Yes	0	100	80	33	100	Yes
Cook (Ashland)	90	NA <sup>b</sup>	25	100	80	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Cook (Englewood)	80	NA <sup>b</sup>	75	100	60	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Cook (Garfield)	90	NA <sup>b</sup>	50	100	80	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Cook (South Suburban)	90	NA <sup>b</sup>	75	100	80	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Greene	80	NA <sup>b</sup>	50	100	60	33	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Indiana	20	No	0	33	60	67	50	Yes
Adams	40	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	80	33	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Allen	0	Yes	0	0	80	100	50	No
Marion	40	Yes	0	0	100	67	25	Yes
Scott	30	No	0	0	40	67	25	No
Wayne	30	Yes	50	100	60	100	50	Yes

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
Iowa	100	Yes	75	100	80	33	50	Yes
Iowa	70	**	0	0	**	67	**	**
Webster	100	**	0	0	**	33	**	**
Kansas	80	No	50	100	80	67	100	Yes
Cherokee	70	No	0	0	40	67	50	No
Franklin	90	No	0	0	60	67	100	No
Linn	70	No	0	0	80	67	50	No
Wichita	60	Yes	0	0	60	67	100	Yes
Wyandotte	40	Yes	50	100	80	67	75	Yes
Kentucky	100	Yes	25	33	100	67	100	Yes
Bell	70	No	0	0	100	67	75	No
Carter	80	No	0	0	100	100	100	No
Hart	70	Yes	0	0	100	67	100	No
Jefferson	70	Yes	0	0	80	100	100	No
Todd	70	No	0	0	80	67	100	No
Louisiana	100	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Caddo	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	50	0	60	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Lincoln	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	40	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
New Orleans	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	40	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
St. Tammany	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	60	33	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Tangipahoa	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	60	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Maine	20	No	50	67	40	67	100	No
Augusta	40	No	25	0	40	33	100	No
Lewiston	0	No	0	33	80	67	100	No

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
Maryland	50	No	0	33	60	67	100	Yes
Allegany	40	No	50	0	60	67	50	No
Baltimore City	0	Yes	25	0	60	67	100	No
Baltimore County	20	Yes	25	0	60	100	75	Yes
Frederick	20	No	25	0	100	67	75	Yes
Montgomery	40	Yes	75	33	60	67	100	Yes
Massachusetts	100	Yes	75	67	60	100	100	Yes
Malden	100	No	25	0	60	0	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Roslindale	100	No	0	0	40	0	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Michigan	50	No	75	100	80	33	100	Yes
Berrien	70	Yes	50	67	40	67	100	Yes
Branch	70	Yes	75	100	40	67	50	Yes
Macomb	50	Yes	75	100	40	67	100	Yes
St. Clair	80	Yes	50	67	40	67	100	Yes
Wayne	20	Yes	100	0	100	67	100	Yes
Minnesota	20	Yes	25	100	80	67	25	Yes
Clay	0	Yes	75	100	80	67	50	Yes
Dakota	40	No	0	0	40	33	25	No
Hennepin	20	Yes	50	100	80	100	50	Yes
Ramsey	20	Yes	50	100	60	33	25	Yes
Waseca	10	No	50	25	40	0	NA <sup>c</sup>	No

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
Mississippi	80	Yes	25	33	60	67	100	No
Attala	100	No	0	0	20	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Hinds	80	No	0	0	40	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	Yes
Lowndes	100	No	0	0	40	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Madison	80	No	0	0	40	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Tishomingo	80	No	0	0	40	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Missouri	80	Yes	25	100	100	67	100	Yes
Buchanan	80	Yes	100	0	60	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Jackson	80	Yes	75	0	40	67	100	No
Lafayette	90	Yes	50	100	60	100	100	No
Pettis	80	No	100	100	40	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
St. Louis	80	No	100	100	60	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Montana	70	No	25	67	60	67	75	Yes
Cascade	60	Yes	0	0	20	67	50	No
Lewis & Clark	90	Yes	100	0	40	67	50	No
Nebraska	50	No	25	67	60	67	100	No
Grand Island	50	No	25	0	60	67	25	No
Lexington	60	No	0	0	20	67	100	No
Lincoln	60	Yes	25	100	60	67	100	No
Omaha	60	Yes	50	67	80	67	75	No
Seward	50	No	25	33	40	100	100	No
Nevada	0	Yes	75	100	80	67	100	Yes
Clark	0	**	50	100	**	67	**	**
Washoe	0	**	50	100	**	100	**	**

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
New Hampshire	100	Yes	0	33	60	67	75	Yes
Dover	80	**	0	0	**	67	**	**
Keene	100	**	0	0	**	0	**	**
New Jersey	0	Yes	0	0	80	67	100	Yes
Burlington	0	Yes	0	0	40	67	100	Yes
Camden	40	Yes	50	100	60	67	75	Yes
Essex	0	Yes	50	100	60	33	75	Yes
Hudson	0	Yes	0	0	40	67	100	Yes
Middlesex	0	Yes	0	0	100	33	100	Yes
New Mexico	80	Yes	100	100	80	33	100	No
Bernalillo	70	No	100	0	60	33	100	No
Cibola	70	No	25	0	40	0	100	No
New York	0	Yes	50	100	60	67	100	Yes
* Broome								
Cortland	60	Yes	25	0	60	67	25	No
Erie	0	Yes	100	0	80	67	50	Yes
New York City	0	Yes	75	25	100	67	100	No
* Onondaga								
North Carolina	20	No	75	100	60	67	100	Yes
Craven	0	Yes	75	0	60	67	75	Yes
Forsyth	0	Yes	50	100	80	100	75	No
Halifax	0	Yes	50	0	100	67	100	No
Haywood	0	Yes	75	0	40	67	25	Yes
Yancey	0	No	50	100	40	100	100	No

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION	OPERATION		AUTOMATED				ALTERNATIVE
	OF THE	OF THE		HISTORY:				
	PROCESS:	Specialized	AUTOMATED	Percentage				
	Percentage	Staff	FUNCTIONS:	of Case				
	of Claims	Involved	Percentage	Action	MANAGEMENT	MONITORING	ESTABLISHMENT	
Process	in Claims	of Routine	and Claims	METHODS:	METHODS:	METHODS:	METHODS:	
Centralized	Establishment	Claims	Payment	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage of	Alternative	
	and Collections	Functions	Histories	of Management	of Monitoring	Establishment	Collections	
		Automated	Automated	Methods Used	Methods Used	Methods Used	Methods Used	
*North Dakota								
Cass	0	No	75	0	40	67	100	No
Emmons	10	No	75	0	40	67	100	No
Grand Forks	30	No	75	100	80	67	75	No
Mountrail	0	No	0	0	80	33	75	No
Stutsman	10	No	0	0	20	0	100	No
Ohio								
Cuyahoga	0	Yes	0	0	60	100	100	Yes
Delaware	0	Yes	0	0	60	67	25	No
Franklin	0	No	25	67	40	33	25	No
Franklin	0	Yes	25	0	80	67	100	No
Mahoning	0	Yes	25	33	60	100	50	Yes
Richland	0	No	0	0	40	67	25	No
Oklahoma								
Carter	100	Yes	50	67	60	67	75	No
Carter	100	**	0	0	**	67	**	**
Custer	100	**	0	0	**	67	**	**
Oregon								
Albany	100	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Albany	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	25	0	40	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Cottage Grove	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	60	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
East Portland	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	75	100	80	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Springfield	90	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	60	67	75	No
West Eugene	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	25	0	40	33	NA <sup>b</sup>	No

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
Pennsylvania	100	Yes	25	100	60	67	50	Yes
Lycoming	80	NA <sup>b</sup>	DK	0	80	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Philadelphia (Center)	80	NA <sup>b</sup>	75	0	60	33	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Philadelphia (Ogontz)	90	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	60	100	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Philadelphia (West)	90	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	60	33	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Westmoreland	90	NA <sup>b</sup>	0	0	60	33	NA <sup>b</sup>	No
Rhode Island	90	Yes	50	100	60	100	100	No
Providence	90	**	0	0	**	67	**	**
Warwick	90	**	50	0	**	67	**	**
South Carolina	20	Yes	75	100	100	100	100	Yes
Darlington	10	Yes	0	100	60	100	100	No
Georgetown	10	Yes	0	100	100	33	100	No
Newberry	20	Yes	0	67	100	67	100	No
Orangeburg	20	Yes	25	100	60	33	75	No
Richland	30	Yes	50	67	80	67	100	No
South Dakota	60	Yes	50	100	100	100	100	Yes
Bennett	60	**	50	100	**	33	**	**
Davison	60	**	50	100	**	67	**	**
Tennessee	60	Yes	0	0	60	0	100	No
Davidson	60	Yes	50	100	60	67	100	No
Sumner	70	Yes	0	0	60	0	100	No

TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
Texas	90	Yes	75	100	100	100	75	Yes
* Bexar								
DelMitt	40	Ref.	50	100	100	67	Ref.	Ref.
* Harris								
Smith	50	Yes	0	67	40	67	100	Yes
Tarrant	80	Yes	25	0	60	67	100	No
Utah	80	Yes	50	67	60	67	100	Yes
Region 2B	80	**	50	67	**	33	**	**
Region 7A	80	**	DK	0	**	33	**	**
Vermont	30	Yes	75	100	100	67	100	No
Hartford	30	**	75	100	**	100	**	**
St. Albans	70	**	25	100	**	67	**	**
Virginia	50	Yes	0	100	80	67	50	No
Charlotte	10	Yes	0	0	80	33	50	Yes
Hampton IC	20	Yes	25	0	40	67	25	No
Norfolk IC	0	Yes	0	0	60	67	50	Yes
* Portsmouth								
Pulaski	20	Yes	0	0	60	33	100	No
Virgin Islands <sup>a</sup>	100	Yes	100	0	40	67	100	No
Washington	70	No	75	100	80	67	100	Yes
Benton	60	No	0	0	60	67	50	No
King-Rainier	60	No	50	0	60	67	100	No
Pierce	80	No	0	0	80	67	75	No
Spokane	60	No	0	0	60	DK	50	No
Vancouver	60	No	0	0	60	67	75	No



TABLE B.1 (continued)

Jurisdiction	ORGANIZATION OF THE PROCESS: Percentage of Claims Process Centralized	OPERATION OF THE PROCESS: Specialized Staff Involved in Claims Establishment and Collections	AUTOMATED FUNCTIONS: Percentage of Routine Claims Functions Automated	AUTOMATED HISTORY: Percentage of Case Action and Claims Payment Histories Automated	MANAGEMENT METHODS: Percentage of Management Methods Used	MONITORING METHODS: Percentage of Monitoring Methods Used	ESTABLISHMENT METHODS: Percentage of Establishment Methods Used	ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS: Alternative Collections Methods Used
West Virginia	100	Yes	50	33	60	67	100	Yes
Beckley	100	**	25	0	**	67	**	**
Charleston	100	**	25	0	**	100	**	**
Wisconsin	0	No	100	0	20	67	25	No
Bayfield	0	No	75	100	60	33	100	No
Douglas	0	No	0	0	80	67	25	No
Milwaukee	0	Yes	100	100	80	67	50	No
Rock	0	Yes	50	0	80	67	50	No
Sauk	0	No	25	100	100	67	25	No
Wyoming	50	Yes	25	100	100	67	75	Yes
Carbon	80	No	25	0	80	67	75	No
Crook	80	No	0	0	60	67	100	Yes
Freemont	60	Yes	0	0	40	67	100	Yes
Matrona	60	Yes	0	0	40	33	100	No
Park	60	No	0	0	80	67	NA <sup>b</sup>	No

TABLE B.1 (continued)

\*State or local FSA refused interview.

\*\*This question was not asked of local FSA respondents in states with predominantly state-operated claims systems.

NA The question is not applicable to this local FSP system.

DK The information was not available at the time of the interview.

Ref. Respondent refused to answer question.

<sup>a</sup>The District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands were not included in the local FSA survey because most claims collection activities are centralized in the state-level FSA.

<sup>b</sup>State-level responsibility.

<sup>c</sup>Fraud is so seldom suspected, it has never been established in this local FSA.

APPENDIX C

## THE SURVEY SAMPLE DESIGN

In this section, we first discuss how the precision needs for estimates at the national level could be met by a simple random sample, and then discuss how the additional objectives of describing state functions are better met by a stratified random sample.

National Level. At the national level, the primary objective of the survey is to provide estimates of the proportion of the caseload administered by local FSAs which follow a particular approach in claims collection. In obtaining these estimates, it will be important to ensure that the sample size is large enough to provide estimates which are accurate to within 10 percent of the true population percentage. This condition is met by simple random samples of at least 100 observations.<sup>1/</sup> We will later argue that the proposed sample under less conservative assumptions provides estimates with a 95 percent confidence interval of  $\pm 6$  percent for national-level estimates.

---

<sup>1/</sup>The requirement that the estimated percentage be within 10 percent of the true population corresponds to the requirement that the standard error of the estimated percentage not exceed 5 percent when the true percentage is 50. The standard error of the estimated percentage ( $s_p$ ) will be

$$s_p = \sqrt{p(1-p)/(n-1)}$$

if the finite population correction factor (fpc) is negligible. The fpc will be negligible whenever the population is very large relative to the sample so that the sampling fraction does not exceed about 5 percent. Since the sampling fraction for a sample of 100 is 100/2900 or 3.4 percent, the fpc can be ignored in calculating the standard error of the estimated percentage. As a result,

$$s_p = \sqrt{.50(1-.50)/(100-1)} = \sqrt{.0025} = .05.$$

Note that the standard error has its greatest value when the population is equally divided between the two classes and, therefore, the true percentage is 50. The standard error of the estimated percentage will be smaller when the true percentage is greater or less than 50.

States with Significant Local Variation. For states with significant local variation, a difficult tradeoff exists between gaining relatively precise information on the alternative approaches that are being used in claims collections and the substantial burden and considerable cost of a large-scale survey. The concern about the cost and resources required for a larger sample are particularly important in this case, where 53 states are involved and the objectives are entirely descriptive. In recognition of these factors, it was decided that large standard errors at the individual state level are acceptable. Assuming that the 2,900 project areas are equally distributed across the states and that 5 sites will be selected from each of the states with substantial local variation, the standard error of the percentage estimates for a particular state will be .24 at its maximum.<sup>2/</sup>

States with Little Local Variation. If little local variation means that the approaches for claims collection are uniform throughout the state, then we only need a sample of only one local FSA per state in order to obtain accurate state-level estimates. A sample of 2 FSAs per state will help confirm that there is little variability, will provide detailed information on how operations are carried out in those 2 sites, and will yield potential intensive assessment sites that have sufficient information to classify them into a given typology. In addition, a sample of 2 FSAs per state meets the sample precision requirements for national-level estimates as outlined earlier.

---

<sup>2/</sup>If the 2,900 project areas are equally distributed across the states, then approximately 55 sites within each state are potential sampling points for the survey. With a sample of 5 sites selected in each state, the fpc should be used. Thus, the standard error of the estimated percentage will be

$$s_p = \sqrt{(1-f) \frac{p(1-p)}{(n-1)}}$$

Assuming that the true population percentage is 50 (which will yield the largest standard error), the standard error of the estimated percentage will be

$$s_p = \sqrt{(.909) \frac{.50(1-.50)}{4}} = .238.$$

If the true percentage is 10, the standard error of the estimated percentage will drop to .14.

Overall Sample Allocation. As indicated, almost 75 percent of the sample will be allocated to the states classified as having substantial local variation (assumed to be approximately 53 percent of the states). Within each of those states, a sample of 5 local FSAs is proposed; a sample of 5 local FSAs is the smallest sample that achieves an acceptable, although large, standard error for state-level percentage estimates. A fixed sample size of 5 sites in each of these states was chosen because, while the number of project areas within the states varies substantially, the standard error of the percentage estimates is not very sensitive to that variation.<sup>3/</sup> The relatively small proportion of the survey sample allocated to those states with little local variation is justified, since state-level estimates are not needed for those states. Hence, only the precision needs for national-level estimates must be met to select the samples from those states. Since those needs can minimally be met with a simple random sample of 100 local FSAs, a stratified sample of the same size for that set of states (as is implied by the sample of 2 FSAs per state) will almost certainly meet those needs. Under a less conservative approach, where the variances of the estimates for those states with little local variation are assumed to be no larger than the variances of the estimates for the states with a sample size of 5, the 95 percent confidence interval for national-level estimates is  $\pm 6$  percent.<sup>4/</sup>

---

<sup>3/</sup>For example, if the number of project areas within a particular state was 200 rather than 55, as we have assumed, the maximum value of the standard error of the percentage estimate would rise to .25.

<sup>4/</sup>This argues that the variance of a percentage estimate for the sample of 190 is the same as for a simple random sample of 265 (5 sites x 53 states). The support for that argument is that most practices in those states with little variation are dictated by the state and, hence, will exhibit little variation. The standard error for a simple random sample of 265 will be

$$\sqrt{(1-f)p \frac{(1-p)}{(n-1)}} = \sqrt{.909 (.25/264)} = .029.$$

## APPENDIX D

**CLAIMS SYSTEM  
STATE CENSUS INSTRUMENT**

**MODULE 1: AGENCY ORGANIZATION**

This interview is divided into ten sections which focus on such issues as the organization and administration of the claims process, the methods used in monitoring overissuances and claims, and the policies and procedures for identifying overissuances, establishing claims and collecting payments on claims.

I would like to begin by asking you about the organizational structure of your state's claims process. Can you give me a brief overview of the organization of the claims process within your state?

NOTES:

In organizing this discussion of the claims process, we have identified six steps or stages. In order to be sure that we are (both/all) talking about the same things, I would like to briefly summarize those stages for you.

The first stage we have identified is the claim referral process. We view this as including the detection of the overissuance and the formal steps by which the claims process is initiated.

The second stage of the process we have identified is the claim investigation. This stage would include the calculation of the total amount of the overissuance, the determination of the nature of the error (i.e., administrative error, inadvertent household error, or intentional program violation), and investigation into the circumstances of the error.

The third stage of the process is claim establishment. Claim establishment for nonfraud claims would include the decision to collect on the claim and the process by which the client is informed of that decision. For fraud claims, claim establishment would include the decision to use prosecution, administrative fraud hearings, disqualification consent agreements, or a waiver of hearing to confirm the allegation of fraud and the process used in setting up the framework for collecting on the claim.

The fourth stage of the claims process is the collection of payments on the claim. This would include setting up the claim for repayment, the use of demand letters, and the procedures for tracking claim payments and recoupments.



The fifth stage of the claims process is the follow-up activities used for delinquent claims. This stage includes the identification of delinquent claims and the use of alternative collection methods, such as wage garnishment or tax refund intercepts.

The final stage of the claims process which we have identified is claim suspension and termination. This stage includes the identification of claims which are eligible for suspension and termination and the processes whereby those actions are taken.

Are these stages clear to you and do they make sense as a framework for discussing the claims process within your state?

EMPHASIZE THE NEED TO USE THE STAGES AS WE HAVE DEFINED THEM IN ORDER TO BE CONSISTENT IN OUR DESCRIPTION OF STATE SYSTEMS.

NOTES:

STAGE 1: CLAIM REFERRAL

STAGE 2: CLAIM INVESTIGATIONS

STAGE 3: CLAIM ESTABLISHMENT

STAGE 4: COLLECTION OF PAYMENTS

STAGE 5: FOLLOW-UP FOR DELINQUENT CLAIMS

STAGE 6: CLAIM SUSPENSION/TERMINATION

- 1.00 For each of the stages of the claims process, where is responsibility for the day-to-day operation of that function? That is, at what organizational level are the activities related to that stage carried out? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.) PROBE FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FRAUD AND NONFRAUD.

NOTE: A REGIONAL OR DISTRICT OFFICE IS AN ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL BETWEEN THE LOCAL AND STATE OFFICE.

	LOCAL FIELD OFFICE	COUNTY OFFICE	REGIONAL OR DISTRICT OFFICE	STATE FSA	OTHER STATE AGENCY	OTHER (SPECIFY)
a. Claim referral?						
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
b. Claim investigations?						
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
c. Establishment of the claim?						
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
d. Collection of claim payments?						
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
e. Follow-up activities on delinquent claims?						
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
f. Claim suspension and termination?						
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	

For those components of the claims process which are operated on the local agency level, we would still like as much information as you have available. In answering questions on areas in which there is variation in the system across the state, we will want to know what is done for the majority of the state caseload and how the approach varies for the remainder of the caseload.

- 1.01 Is any part of the claims process for Food Stamps integrated with the claims processes of other assistance programs, such as AFDC, Medicaid, or GA?

NOTE: AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM IS ONE IN WHICH THE SAME STAFF UNIT HANDLES CLAIMS FOR THE FSP AND THE OTHER PROGRAM(S).

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 2).....0

- 1.02 Which other programs are integrated with Food Stamps claims at the stage of: (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>AFDC</u>	<u>MEDICAID</u>	<u>GA</u>	<u>OTHER</u> <u>(SPECIFY)</u>
a. Claim referrals?	1	1	1	_____
b. Claim investigations?	1	1	1	_____
c. Establishment of claims?	1	1	1	_____
d. Collection of claim payments?				
RECOUPMENT	1*	1	1	_____
OTHER METHODS	1	1	1	_____
e. Follow-up activities on delinquent claims?	1	1	1	_____
f. Claim suspension and termination?	1	1	1	_____

\*IF FSP AND AFDC RECOUPMENT ARE INTEGRATED, ASK--How is recoupment for Food Stamps and AFDC linked? (PROBE: IS RECOUPMENT HANDLED BY THE SAME UNIT, THE SAME STAFF, AND/OR THE SAME AUTOMATED SYSTEM?)

NOTES:

## MODULE 2: ADMINISTRATION CONTROL

There are a variety of ways that an agency can manage the claims process. We are interested in the management methods used in your state. In answering these questions, the focus should be on the most common approach used within your state.

2.00 Does your agency produce routine summary reports (other than the FNS-209) which assess how well the claims system is working?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO 2.02).....0

2.01 Do those summary reports include reports on activities at the various stages of the claims process? That is, are there summary reports concerning:

(IF YES, ASK) How frequently are those reports prepared? Who receives the report? (MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE FOR "WHO RECEIVES?".)

	REPORTS?		FREQUENCY?	WHO RECEIVES?			
	YES	NO					
a. Claim referrals?							
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Claim investigations?							
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Establishment of claims?							
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Collection of claim payments?							
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
e. Follow-up activities on delinquent claims?							
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
f. Claim suspensions and terminations?							
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

CODES FOR FREQUENCY

1. LESS THAN MONTHLY
2. MONTHLY
3. QUARTERLY
4. SEMI-ANNUALLY
5. ANNUALLY
6. IRREGULAR
7. OTHER

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

CODES FOR WHO RECEIVES

OFFICE (NON-CLAIM UNIT):

3. LOCAL
4. DISTRICT
5. STATE

CLAIM UNIT:

6. LOCAL
7. DISTRICT
8. STATE

FRAUD UNIT:

9. LOCAL
10. DISTRICT
11. STATE

16. OTHER

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

2.02 Are the relevant workers provided with training specifically related to the claims process?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 2.05).....0

2.03 Does this training in the claims process include:

	FRAUD		NONFRAUD	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Training for new hires?	1	0	1	0
b. Scheduled refresher training for existing staff?	1	0	1	0
c. Retraining as needed (for example, following a rule change)?	1	0	1	0

2.04 Where is the emphasis placed in the training? (PROBE: Is it in detecting overissuances, fraud investigations, or techniques for following-up delinquent claims?)

NOTES:

2.05 Are there written manuals available to the staff which provide detailed information on the policies and procedures of the claims process?

YES.....1  
NO.....0

2.06 Do you have any time limits which control how long workers have to complete the processing of cases?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO MODULE 3).....0

2.07 Are there established time limits for:

(IF YES, ASK) What are those time limits? What percent of cases are you able to process within those time limits?

	TIME LIMITS?		<u>NOTES:</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>		
a. Making claim referrals?				
FRAUD	1	0		□□□□
NONFRAUD	1	0		□□□□
b. Completing claim investigations?				
FRAUD	1	0		□□□□
NONFRAUD	1	0		□□□□
c. Establishing the claims?				
FRAUD	1	0		□□□□
NONFRAUD	1	0		□□□□
d. Completing follow-up activities on delinquent claims?				
FRAUD	1	0		□□□□
NONFRAUD	1	0		□□□□
e. Suspending the claim?				
FRAUD	1	0		□□□□
NONFRAUD	1	0		□□□□

### MODULE 3: CLAIMS MONITORING

Now I would like to talk with you about the processes and procedures that you have for monitoring overissuances and claims. Again, the focus will be on the most common approach if there is variation across the state.

3.00 Is any part of the claims process within your state automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 3.09).....0

3.01 Does the automated part of your claims process cover the entire state?

YES.....(GO TO 3.03).....1  
NO.....0

3.02 What part of the state is covered by the automated component of the claims process?

PERCENT OF CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

PERCENT OF LOCAL OFFICES.....|\_|\_|

NOTES:

3.03 Is the certification system in (your state/ that part of the state with an automated claims process) also automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 3.05).....0



3.04 Is the automated claims process integrated with the automated certification system?

NOTE: AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM IS ONE IN WHICH THE SAME DATA BASE IS USED FOR BOTH THE CLAIMS AND CERTIFICATION PROCESSES.

YES.....1  
NO.....0

3.05 Does your automated system calculate the amount of the overissuance?

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>
YES.....	1	1
NO....(GO TO 3.07 IF "NO" FOR BOTH).....	0	0

3.06 How far back does the automated system permit the overissuance to be calculated?

MONTHS.....|\_|\_|

3.07 Are the calculations and deductions for recoupment automated? Does the system generate demand letters?

NOTE: WE ARE NOT CONCERNED WITH WHICH AUTOMATED SYSTEM DOES THESE FUNCTIONS. (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
RECOUPMENT:		
FRAUD.....	1	0
NONFRAUD.....	1	0
DEMAND LETTERS:		
FRAUD.....	1	0
NONFRAUD.....	1	0

3.08 Do you maintain an automated history for the:

	FRAUD		NONFRAUD	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Dates of actions taken on overissuances and claims?				
DATES OF ALL ACTIONS	1	0	1	0
DATE OF LATEST ACTION	1	0	1	0
OTHER	1	0	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____	1	0	1	0
b. Dates of claim payments through recoupment?	1	0	1	0
c. Dates of other types of claim payments?	1	0	1	0
d. Date of claim suspension?	1	0	1	0

3.09 Do you have an established process (either manual or automated) for tracking individual overissuances and claims?

YES.....1  
 NO....(GO TO 3.11).....0

3.10 Does your process for monitoring claims include the tracking of:

(IF YES, ASK) Is the tracking automated?

	TRACKING?		AUTOMATED?	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Computer match hits?	1	0	1	0
b. Other apparent overissuances?	1	0	1	0
c. Claim referrals?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
d. Claim investigations?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
e. Established claims?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
f. Claim payments?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
g. Suspended claims?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
h. Individuals disqualified because of fraud claims?	1	0	1	0

3.11 Do you flag the files of households with overissuances or claims which require actions by the agency? That is, is there a system for signaling workers that a household case needs further attention?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 3.13).....0

3.12 For which types of cases do you have flags?

(FOR EACH TYPE, ASK) Are the flags automated? Who is alerted by the flags? (MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE.) Are the flags permanently attached to the case; that is, are they carried on the records of households that are no longer participating in the program so that the flags are visible to staff if the household reapplies?

	FLAGS?		AUTOMATED?		WHO'S ALERTED?	PERMANENT?	
	YES	NO	YES	NO		YES	NO
FRAUD REFERRALS	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD REFERRALS	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
CASES WITH ACTIVE CLAIM BALANCES	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
CASES WITH DELINQUENT CLAIMS	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
CASES WITH SUSPENDED CLAIMS	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
OTHER	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____					<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	CODES FOR WHO'S ALERTED	

OFFICE (NON-CLAIM UNIT):

- 3. LOCAL
- 4. DISTRICT
- 5. STATE

CLAIM UNIT:

- 6. LOCAL
- 7. DISTRICT
- 8. STATE

FRAUD UNIT:

- 9. LOCAL
- 10. DISTRICT
- 11. STATE

16. OTHER

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

3.13 How do you identify applicant households which include members who have been disqualified from the program because of a fraud claim?

NOTES:

3.14 Do you produce routine reports on the status of individual cases with overissuances and claims?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 3.16).....0

3.15 Do these reports include status reports on individual cases with:

(IF YES, ASK) Is the preparation of these reports automated? Who receives these reports? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE FOR "WHO RECEIVES?".)

	REPORTS?		AUTOMATED?		WHO RECEIVES?
	YES	NO	YES	NO	
a. Claim referrals?					
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Established claims?					
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Delinquent claims?					
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

CODES FOR WHO RECEIVES

OFFICE (NON-CLAIM UNIT):

- 3. LOCAL
- 4. DISTRICT
- 5. STATE

CLAIM UNIT:

- 6. LOCAL
- 7. DISTRICT
- 8. STATE

FRAUD UNIT:

- 9. LOCAL
- 10. DISTRICT
- 11. STATE

16. OTHER

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

3.16 Do you have an established process for aging overissuances and claims, that is, a process for sorting and reporting on overissuances and claims by their ages?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 4).....0

3.17 Does your process for aging overissuances and claims involve keeping track of the ages of:

(IF YES, ASK) What is the starting event? Is the aging automated?

NOTE: THE "STARTING EVENT" IS THE EVENT WHICH IS USED AS THE BASIS FOR AGING.

	AGING?		STARTING	AUTOMATED?	
	YES	NO	EVENT?	YES	NO
a. Apparent overissuances?	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
b. Claim referrals?					
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
c. Claim investigations?					
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
d. Delinquent claims?					
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
e. Suspended claims?					
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0

CODES FOR EVENT

1. DETECTION
2. REFERRAL
3. ESTABLISHMENT
4. FAILURE TO PAY
5. SUSPENSION
6. OTHER

NOTE: IF THERE ARE ANY "OTHER" STARTING EVENTS DESCRIBE BELOW, INCLUDING LETTER (a-e) INDICATING ITEM TRACKED.

#### MODULE 4: CLAIM REFERRAL

Now I would like to talk about the first stage of the claims process--claim referral. As before, if variation in the approach used occurs across the state, please tell me about the most common approach.

4.00 Which of the following methods are successfully used in the identification of overissuances:

(READ LIST OF METHODS. ONLY OBTAIN RANKING FOR METHODS THE STATE USES.) How would you rank the detection methods used in order of their importance? (By importance, I mean responsible for identifying the most overissuances.)

(CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	USED?		RANKING
	YES	NO	
a. QC reviews?	1	0	_ _
b. Recertification review?	1	0	_ _
c. Computer matching of wages?	1	0	_ _
d. Computer matching of unearned income?	1	0	_ _
e. Computer matching of resources?	1	0	_ _
f. Duplicate participation checks?	1	0	_ _
g. Special investigation units?	1	0	_ _
h. Internal audits?	1	0	_ _
i. Error prone profile?	1	0	_ _
j. Hotline, "whistleblowing" or informal complaints?	1	0	_ _
k. Information from other agencies?	1	0	_ _
l. Conflicting information from the recipient?	1	0	_ _
m. Other?	1	0	_ _
(SPECIFY) _____			_ _

## MODULE 5: CLAIM INVESTIGATIONS

Moving on to the stage of claim investigations, I would like to ask you about the processes for the calculation of the overissuance amount, the determination of the nature of the error, and any investigations into the circumstances of the error. Would you briefly describe the process for investigating fraud and nonfraud claims used in your state?

NOTES:

5.00 Who is generally responsible for the decision to refer an overissuance case for fraud investigation? (CIRCLE ONE.)

ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....1  
EW SUPERVISOR.....2  
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....6  
DISTRICT.....7  
STATE.....8  
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....9  
DISTRICT.....10  
STATE.....11  
OTHER.....16

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

5.01 At what stage in the claims process is that decision typically made?

IN CONJUNCTION WITH CLAIM REFERRAL.....1  
AS PART OF INVESTIGATION FOLLOWING REFERRAL.....2  
OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

5.02 What percent of overissuances are referred for fraud investigations?

PERCENT.....



- 5.03 There are two broad categories of claim referrals: referrals for nonfraud errors and referrals for suspected fraud. Does your state place more emphasis upon the investigation and establishment of fraud claims than

upon the investigation and establishment of nonfraud claims? IF NO, PROBE FOR WHETHER THE EMPHASIS IS THE OTHER WAY--NONFRAUD OVER FRAUD CLAIMS.

NO DIFFERENCE.....(GO TO 5.05).....1  
FRAUD OVER NONFRAUD.....2  
NONFRAUD OVER FRAUD.....3

- 5.04 Would you tell me about your state's emphasis for claim investigation and establishment and the reasons behind those policies?

NOTES:

- 5.05 Who is generally responsible for investigating the circumstances of the overissuances for nonfraud cases? For cases of suspected fraud? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1
(SPECIFY) _____		

- 5.06 What is the policy for investigating how far back an overissuance existed? PROBE FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FRAUD AND NONFRAUD CASES.

NOTES:

- 5.07 Is the overissuance amount calculated for every case in which there is an overissuance or do you dismiss some cases before doing the work-up?

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>
ALWAYS CALCULATED...(GO TO 5.09 IF "1" FOR BOTH).....1		1
NOT ALWAYS CALCULATED.....0		0

- 5.08 When is the overissuance amount not calculated? PROBE FOR DIFFERENCES BY FRAUD AND NONFRAUD CASES AND BY ACTIVE AND INACTIVE CASES.

NOTES:

- 5.09 How far back do you go in calculating the amount of the overissuance? (CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>
TWELVE MONTHS.....1		1
FULL AMOUNT WITHIN SIX YEAR LIMIT.....2		2
OTHER.....3		3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

- 5.10 How extensive is the investigation of the actual circumstances of the household versus their reported circumstances? That is, does the investigation include searching for other possible sources of error and/or fraud in addition to that which has been discovered?

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>
YES.....1		1
NO.....0		0

NOTES:

- 5.11 Focusing on nonfraud cases, what steps or methods are typically used in conducting an investigation of a nonfraud case?

(FOR EACH METHOD USED, ASK:) Is/are (METHOD) always used? (IF NOT ALWAYS USED, ASK:) How often is/are (METHOD) used? What (does its/do their) use depend upon?

NOTES

	USED?		ALWAYS?		PERCENT
	YES	NO	YES	NO	OF CASES
CASE FILE REVIEW	1	0	1	0	_ _
IN-OFFICE INTERVIEW	1	0	1	0	_ _
HOME VISIT	1	0	1	0	_ _
THIRD-PARTY CONTACTS	1	0	1	0	_ _
OTHER	1	0	1	0	_ _
(SPECIFY) _____					_ _

- 5.12 Are there established policies or procedures for determining which of the claims referred for nonfraud errors will be most actively pursued (INVESTIGATED) prior to claim establishment? This would include any policies for prioritizing cases when there is a backlog of claim referrals to be processed?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 5.17).....0

- 5.13 In setting up these priorities for nonfraud cases, what characteristics of a case would increase the likelihood of that case being pursued (INVESTIGATED) prior to claim establishment? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.) PROBE FOR ANY DISTINCTION BETWEEN PA AND NPA HOUSEHOLDS.

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
AGE OF CLIENT.....	1	0
PA HOUSEHOLD.....	1	0
HOUSEHOLD ERROR.....	1	0
RECENT ERROR.....	1	0
ACTIVE CASE.....	1	0
LARGER DOLLAR AMOUNT.....	1	0
OTHER.....	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____		_ _

5.14 What are the reasons behind these policies?

NOTES:

5.15 How is the prioritizing of cases done? PROBE, IF NEEDED--Is there a very structured scoring of cases based on the dimensions you listed or is it a more informal process intended to provide only general guidelines?

RIGOROUS SCORING.....1  
GENERAL GUIDELINES.....(GO TO 5.17).....2  
OTHER.....(GO TO 5.17).....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

NOTES:

5.16 Is this scoring of cases automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....0

5.17 At the conclusion of the investigation of nonfraud referrals, who generally makes the decision that a claim should be established? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....1  
EW SUPERVISOR.....1  
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
                  DISTRICT.....1  
                  STATE.....1  
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
                  DISTRICT.....1  
                  STATE.....1  
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

5.18 Now let's talk about cases of suspected fraud.

What steps or methods are typically used in conducting an investigation of a case of suspected fraud?

(FOR EACH METHOD USED, ASK:) Is/are (METHOD) always used? (IF NOT ALWAYS USED, ASK:) How often is/are (METHOD) used? What (does its/do their) use depend upon?

	USED?		ALWAYS?		PERCENT
	YES	NO	YES	NO	OF CASES
CASE FILE REVIEW	1	0	1	0	_ _ _
IN-OFFICE INTERVIEW	1	0	1	0	_ _ _
HOME VISIT	1	0	1	0	_ _ _
THIRD-PARTY CONTACTS	1	0	1	0	_ _ _
INTERVIEW WITNESSES	1	0	1	0	_ _ _
FORENSIC INVESTIGATION	1	0	1	0	_ _ _
OTHER	1	0	1	0	_ _ _
(SPECIFY) _____					_ _ _

5.19 Are there established policies or procedures for determining which of the claims referred for suspected fraud will be most actively pursued (INVESTIGATED) prior to claim establishment? This would include any policies for prioritizing cases when there is a backlog of claim referrals to be processed?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 5.24).....0

- 5.20 In setting up these priorities for suspected fraud cases, what characteristics of a case would increase the likelihood of that case being pursued (INVESTIGATED) as suspected fraud prior to claim establishment? (CIRCLE "1 OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.) PROBE WHETHER ANY EMPHASIS ON PA OVER NPA HOUSEHOLDS.

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
AGE OF CLIENT.....	1	0
PA HOUSEHOLD.....	1	0
MORE RECENT ERROR.....	1	0
PARTICIPANT HOUSEHOLD.....	1	0
LARGER DOLLAR AMOUNT.....	1	0
QUALITY OF EVIDENCE.....	1	0
REPEAT OFFENDER.....	1	0
FLAGRANT VIOLATION.....	1	0
OTHER.....	1	0

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.21 What are the reasons behind these policies?

NOTES:

- 5.22 How is the prioritizing of cases done? PROBE, IF NEEDED--Is there a very structured scoring of cases based on the dimensions you listed or is it a more informal process intended to provide only general guidelines?

RIGOROUS SCORING.....	1
GENERAL GUIDELINES....(GO TO 5.24)...	2
OTHER.....(GO TO 5.24)...	3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

NOTES:

- 5.23 Is this scoring of cases automated?

YES.....	1
NO.....	0

- 5.24 Who is generally responsible for the decision to pursue a case of suspected fraud as a fraud claim? That is, who determines that a particular case merits the extra effort required to confirm the fraud allegation?  
(CIRCLE ONE.)

ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....1  
EW SUPERVISOR.....2  
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....6  
                  DISTRICT.....7  
                  STATE.....8  
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....9  
                  DISTRICT.....10  
                  STATE.....11  
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....12  
OTHER.....16

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.25 What factors enter into that decision? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
AVAILABLE STAFF TIME.....1	0	
STRENGTH OF EVIDENCE.....1	0	
OTHER.....1	0	

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.26 How is a fraud referral handled after it has been decided not to pursue that case as a fraud claim?

PROCESSED AS NONFRAUD CLAIM.....1  
OTHER.....2

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

## MODULE 6: CLAIM ESTABLISHMENT

The next stage of the claims process to be discussed is claim establishment. Would you give me a brief overview of the processes for establishing a claim?

NOTES:

6.00 For cases of suspected fraud, how would you rank the following claim establishment methods in order of their frequency of use?

	USED		RANKING
	YES	NO	
a. Fraud prosecution	1	0	
b. Administrative fraud hearing	1	0	
c. Disqualification consent agreement	1	0	
d. Waiver of hearing	1	0	

6.01 How are decisions made about which of these methods will be used to establish a fraud claim?

NOTES:



- 6.02 What are the important factors (characteristics of the cases and characteristics of the system) in the decision? PROBE FOR ROLE OF PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE IN THE DECISION AND NATURE OF ANY AGREEMENT WITH THE PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE.

NOTES:

- 6.03 Which cases are referred for prosecution and why? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
LARGER DOLLAR AMOUNT.....	1	0
REPEAT OFFENDER.....	1	0
FLAGRANT VIOLATION.....	1	0
OTHER.....	1	0

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

NOTES:

- 6.04 Prior to the establishment of the fraud claim, how are the overissuances due to suspected fraud handled?

NO ACTION TAKEN.....	1
OVERISSUANCE IN 12 MONTHS	
PRIOR TO DISCOVERY	
PROCESSED AS NONFRAUD.....	2
OTHER.....	3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

6.05 Earlier we talked about the decision to establish a claim for a nonfraud referral and the decision to pursue a case of suspected fraud as a fraud claim. Is there a process whereby management or staff at a higher level review these decisions?

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
YES.....	1	1
NO....(GO TO 6.08 IF NO ("0") FOR <u>BOTH</u> NONFRAUD AND FRAUD)...	0	0

6.06 Are all decisions reviewed, or only a random sample of the decisions, or is some other method used for selecting which decisions to review? (CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ALL ACTIONS.....	1	1
RANDOM SAMPLE.....	2	2
OTHER.....	3	3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

6.07 Who is responsible for reviewing the decisions? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
EW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

- 6.08 For nonfraud claims, who is responsible for notifying the household of the claim (i.e., mailing the demand letter or arranging for the demand letter to be mailed)? And for fraud claims, who is responsible for notifying the household of the claim? (CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD (COURT)</u>	<u>FRAUD (OTHER)</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	6	6	6
DISTRICT.....	7	7	7
STATE.....	8	8	8
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	9	9	9
DISTRICT.....	10	10	10
STATE.....	11	11	11
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	12	12	12
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....	13	13	13
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	15	15	15
OTHER.....	16	16	16

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

# **MODULE 7: COLLECTION OF PAYMENTS**

I would now like to talk with you about the policies and procedures for recovering the claim once collection actions have been initiated. This stage of the claims process--claim collections--includes setting up the claim for repayment, the use of demand letters, and the use of recoupment. Would you briefly describe the way your state's collection process works?

NOTES:

7.00 Who is generally responsible for making arrangements with the household on the payment of the claim? (CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD (COURT)</u>	<u>FRAUD (OTHER)</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....1		1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....6		6	6
DISTRICT.....7		7	7
STATE.....8		8	8
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....9		9	9
DISTRICT.....10		10	10
STATE.....11		11	11
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....12		12	12
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....13		13	13
PROBATION OFFICE.....14		14	14
OTHER.....16		16	16
(SPECIFY) _____			

- 7.01 Who has responsibility for identifying households which fail to respond to the initial demand letter? (CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	6	6
DISTRICT.....	7	7
STATE.....	8	8
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	9	9
DISTRICT.....	10	10
STATE.....	11	11
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	12	12
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....	13	13
PROBATION OFFICE.....	14	14
OTHER.....	16	16

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

- 7.02 What are the policies and procedures for handling cases where the household does not respond to the initial demand letter? PROBE FOR DIFFERENCES IN HANDLING OF IHE, IPV AND AE CLAIMS.

NOTES:

- 7.03 How frequently are follow-up demand letters mailed to households once the claim is established? (CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (IHE)</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (AE)</u>
MONTHLY.....	1	1	1
NO FIXED SCHEDULE.....	2	2	2
OTHER.....	3	3	3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

7.04 Is there some standard for how many letters are mailed if the household does not respond?

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (IHE)</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (AE)</u>
YES.....	1	1	1
NO....(GO TO 7.06).....	0	0	0

7.05 How many letters are mailed?

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (IHE)</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (AE)</u>
LETTERS.....	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

NOTES:

7.06 Under what circumstances is the household's food stamp allotment reduced through recoupment? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

NOT ROUTINELY USED.....1  
 AGENCY ERROR IF CLIENT CONSENTS.....1  
 HOUSEHOLD ERROR.....1  
 FRAUD.....1  
 OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY)

# **MODULE 8: FOLLOW-UP FOR DELINQUENT CLAIMS**

I would now like to talk with you about the follow-up activities used by your state for delinquent claims.

8.00 What methods (other than demand letters) are used to notify households of delinquent claims? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (IHE)</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (AE)</u>
NONE.....	1	1	1
MONTHLY BILLING (SEPARATE FROM DEMAND LETTER).....	1	1	1
PHONE CALLS.....	1	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1	1
(SPECIFY) _____			

8.01 Which of the following alternative collection methods are used? How would you rank the alternative collection methods used in order of their frequency of use? Can you tell me the approximate number of cases for which each collection method was used in FY 1985?

	<u>USED?</u>		<u>IF YES, RANKING</u>	<u>ASK-- NUMBER</u>
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>		
a. Tax refund intercept	1	0		,
b. Wage garnishment	1	0		,
c. Property liens	1	0		,
d. Small claims court	1	0		,
e. Private collection agency	1	0		,
f. Credit bureau	1	0		,
g. Other	1	0		,
(SPECIFY) _____				

IF NO ALTERNATIVE METHODS USED, GO TO 8.08a.

- 8.02 Who generally makes the decision to initiate alternative collection actions against households which fail to make payments on their claims? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
EW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FINANGIAL UNIT: STATE.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1
(SPECIFY) _____		

- 8.03 Are there established policies or procedures for determining which cases are pursued through the alternative collection methods?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 8.08a).....0

- 8.04 In determining which cases are to be pursued through alternative collection methods, what characteristics of a case increase the probability of that case being selected? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	YES	NO
PA HOUSEHOLD.....	1	0
FRAUD CLAIM.....	1	0
OLDER ERROR.....	1	0
OLDER CLAIM.....	1	0
LONG TERM DELINQUENCY.....	1	0
INACTIVE HOUSEHOLD.....	1	0
LARGER DOLLAR AMOUNT.....	1	0
OTHER.....	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____		

- 8.05 What are the reasons behind these policies?

NOTES:



8.06 How is the selection of cases carried out? IF NEEDED, PROBE--Is it a very structured scoring of cases based on the dimensions you have listed or is it a more informal process intended to provide only general guidelines?

RIGOROUS SCORING.....1  
 GENERAL GUIDELINES..(GO TO 8.08a)....2  
 OTHER.....(GO TO 8.08a)....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

8.07 Is this sorting of cases automated?

YES.....1  
 NO.....0

8.08a Who is responsible for monitoring the repayment of claims from households when recoupment is used? That is, who is responsible for identifying households with delinquent claim payments when recoupment is used as the collection method? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1
(SPECIFY) _____	_ _	_ _

8.08b Who is responsible (FOR MONITORING THE REPAYMENT OF CLAIMS) when lump sum or installment methods are used? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

IF NO ALTERNATIVE COLLECTION METHODS USED, GO TO MODULE 9.

8.08c Who is responsible (FOR MONITORING THE REPAYMENT OF CLAIMS) when alternative collections methods are used? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

## MODULE 9: SUSPENSION/TERMINATION OF CLAIMS

Now, I would like to talk with you about how the agency reaches the decision that it is no longer worthwhile to pursue an outstanding claim.

9.00 Who is generally responsible for identifying claims which should be considered for suspension? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
DISTRICT.....	1	1
STATE.....	1	1
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1
(SPECIFY) _____		

9.01 Is there a review of delinquent claims to determine which ones should be suspended?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 9.07).....0

9.02 Would you describe this review process?

NOTES:

9.03 Is this review of delinquent claims automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....0

9.04 What percent of delinquent claims are reviewed and, of those claims reviewed, what percent are suspended?

PERCENT REVIEWED.....|\_|\_|

PERCENT SUSPENDED.....|\_|\_|

9.05 How effective is this review process in reducing the backlog of delinquent claims?

NOTES:

9.06 Are there claims which qualify for suspension but are not suspended? (IF YES, ASK) Why are they not suspended?

YES.....1

NO.....0

-NOTES:

- 9.07 Who is responsible for determining that a claim should be suspended?  
(CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
EW SUPERVISOR.....	2	2
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	6	6
DISTRICT.....	7	7
STATE.....	8	8
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	9	9
DISTRICT.....	10	10
STATE.....	11	11
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....	13	13
OTHER.....	16	16

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

- 9.08 What is the process by which claims are suspended? What documentation is required in order to suspend a claim?

NOTES:

- 9.09 Do you have a procedure for reactivating suspended claims?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 9.11).....0

- 9.10 Would you describe that procedure?

NOTES:

9.11 Are there established policies or procedures for determining when suspended claims should be terminated?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 9.13).....0

9.12 Would you describe those policies and procedures? PROBE FOR REASONS BEHIND THE POLICIES.

NOTES:

9.13 Who is responsible for determining that a suspended claim should be terminated? (CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....	1	1
EW SUPERVISOR.....	2	2
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	6	6
DISTRICT.....	7	7
STATE.....	8	8
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	9	9
DISTRICT.....	10	10
STATE.....	11	11
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....	13	13
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	15	15
OTHER.....	16	16

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

9.14 What are the criteria for terminating a suspended claim? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	YES	NO
CLAIM SUSPENDED FOR 3 YEARS.....	1	0
OTHER.....	1	0

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

9.15 After claims have been suspended, do you ever keep them on the books for more than three years?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 9.18).....0

9.16 For how long do you generally retain suspended claims on the books?

INDEFINITELY.....99  
YEARS.....

9.17 What are the reasons for carrying the claims longer than the required three years?

NOTES:

9.18 Earlier we talked about the decision to suspend a claim and the decision to terminate a claim. Is there a process by which management or staff at a higher level review those decisions? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
SUSPENDED:		
FRAUD.....1		0
NONFRAUD.....1		0
TERMINATED:		
FRAUD.....1		0
NONFRAUD.....1		0

IF ALL RESPONSES ARE "NO", GO TO MODULE 10.

9.19 Are all decisions reviewed, or only a random sample of the decisions, or is some other method used to select decisions to review?

	<u>ALL ACTIONS</u>	<u>RANDOM SAMPLE</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>(SPECIFY)</u>
SUSPENDED: FRAUD	1	2	3	____ _ _
NONFRAUD	1	2	3	____ _ _
TERMINATED: FRAUD	1	2	3	____ _ _
NONFRAUD	1	2	3	____ _ _

9.20 Who is responsible for reviewing those decisions? (CIRCLE ONE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>SUSPENSIONS</u>		<u>TERMINATIONS</u>	
	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>
ELIGIBILITY WORKER.....1		1	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....6		6	6	6
DISTRICT.....7		7	7	7
STATE.....8		8	8	8
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....9		9	9	9
DISTRICT.....10		10	10	10
STATE.....11		11	11	11
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR...12		12	12	12
FINANCIAL UNIT: STATE.....13		13	13	13
PROBATION OFFICE.....14		14	14	14
OTHER.....16		16	16	16
(SPECIFY) _____				



**MODULE 10: MAGNITUDE OF OVERISSUANCES AND CLAIMS**

I would now like to ask you some questions about the magnitude of the overissuances and claims problems that your claims system is addressing. If possible, I would like information for FY 1985 in order to supplement the information on your state's FNS-209 forms.

10.00 Do you maintain information on the number and value of overissuances identified and claim referrals received in FY 1985?

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO 10.06).....0

10.01 How many overissuances were identified in FY 1985? What was the dollar value of these overissuances?

OVERISSUANCES.....| | | , | | | , | | |

DOLLAR VALUE.....| | | , | | | , | | |

10.02 How many claim referrals were made in FY 1985? What was the value of those referrals?

REFERRALS.....| | | , | | | , | | |

DOLLAR VALUE.....| | | , | | | , | | |

10.03 Of the claims referrals that were made in FY 1985, how many were established as claims in FY 1985? What was the dollar value of these claims?

ESTABLISHED CLAIMS.....| | | , | | | , | | |

10.04 Of the total number of claims that were established in FY 1985, how many

10.05 Of the total number of claims that were established in FY 1985, how many were suspended FY 1985? What was the initial dollar value of these suspended claims? How much is still unpaid?

SUSPENDED CLAIMS.....| | | , | | | , | | |

INITIAL VALUE OF CLAIMS...| | | , | | | , | | |

REMAINING BALANCE.....| | | , | | | , | | |

10.06 What would be your professional estimate for the current year or for the last few years of:

- a. IF 10.01 AND 10.02 ANSWERED, GO TO 10.06b.  
The percentage of identified overissuances which result in claim referrals?

PERCENT.....| | |

- b. IF 10.02 AND 10.03 ANSWERED, GO TO 10.06c.  
The percentage of claim referrals which result in established claims?

PERCENT.....| | |

- c. The percentage of claim referrals for suspected fraud which result in established claims for fraud?

PERCENT.....| | |

- d. IF 10.03 AND 10.04 ANSWERED, GO TO 10.06e.  
The percentage of established claims for which at least some collections are made?

PERCENT.....| | |

- e. The percentage of established claims which eventually become delinquent?

PERCENT.....| | |

- f. The percentage of delinquent claims which are suspended?

PERCENT.....| | |

10.07 Many states have backlogs of cases to be processed at each stage of the claims system. To help us get an idea of the time required to process cases through the system, would you tell me the approximate number of days required to complete:

a. The claim referral from the date the overissuance was identified FROM    TO    DAYS

b. The establishment of a nonfraud claim from the date of referral FROM    TO    DAYS

c. The establishment of a fraud claim from the date of referral FROM    TO    DAYS

10.08 What do you see as the reasons for backlogs of overissuances and claims which need to be processed? What has your state done to address this problem?

NOTES:

10.09 Finally, I would like some general information about the characteristics of your PA and NPA caseloads. What percentage of the active households in your PA and NPA caseloads have active claims?

PERCENT OF PA CASELOAD.....

PERCENT OF NPA CASELOAD.....

10.10 What percentage of the active households in your PA and NPA caseloads have suspended claims?

PERCENT OF PA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

PERCENT OF NPA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

10.11 What percentage of the active households in your PA and NPA caseloads are repaying claims through recoupment?

PERCENT OF PA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

PERCENT OF NPA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

10.12 Finally, I would like a little information on the AFDC caseload if you have it. What percentage of AFDC cases are repaying AFDC claims through recoupment?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|

## APPENDIX E

**CLAIMS SYSTEM**  
**LOCAL OFFICE SURVEY INSTRUMENT**  
**TYPE B**

TYPE B

ID #

**CLAIMS SYSTEM  
LOCAL OFFICE SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

**MODULE 1: AGENCY ORGANIZATION**

Our understanding of the claims collection process within your state suggests that there is both state and local involvement in that process. Our earlier discussions with state Food Stamp staff provided a description of the claims activities which occur at the state level, we would like to talk with you about the claims functions which are handled at the local level.

I would like to begin by asking you about the organizational structure of your agency's claims process. Can you give me a brief overview of the organization of the claims process within your agency? (TRY TO GET A CLEAR PICTURE OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.)

NOTES:

1.00 Are there any specialized staff or specialized units involved in the claims process within your agency? By specialized we mean devoted exclusively to processing overissuances and/or claims.

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO PAGE 5).....0

1.01 Could you tell me a little about those staff and/or units? What are the titles of the staff and/or names of the units? What agency are they with? What are their functions? Do they handle both (suspected) fraud and nonfraud claims? Do they handle claims for other programs besides Food Stamps? How many full-time staff of each special type do you have and/or how large is the specialized unit? (FILL IN THE GRID BELOW.)

	Unit/Staff #1	Unit/Staff #2	Unit/Staff #3	Unit/Staff #4
Name of Unit/Staff	_____	_____	_____	_____
Agency	_____	_____	_____	_____
Functions	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
Handles:				
Fraud	YES NO 1 0	YES NO 1 0	YES NO 1 0	YES NO 1 0
Nonfraud	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Handles:				
AFDC	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
GA	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Medicaid	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Other	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
(SPECIFY)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Number of Staff (FTE)	_____	_____	_____	_____

CODES FOR FUNCTIONS

1. DETECTION
  2. REFERRALS
  3. INVESTIGATIONS
  4. CALCULATION
  5. PROSECUTION
  6. ADMIN. DISQUAL. HEARINGS
  7. COLLECTIONS
  8. SUSPENSION
  9. FOLLOW-UP ON DELINQUENT CLAIMS
  10. TERMINATION
  11. MANAGEMENT
  12. OTHER
- (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_



	Unit/Staff #5	Unit/Staff #6	Unit/Staff #7	Unit/Staff #8
Name of Unit/Staff	_____	_____	_____	_____
Agency	_____	_____	_____	_____
Functions	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Handles: Fraud	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Nonfraud	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0

	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Handles: AFDC	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
GA	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Medical	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Other	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
(SPECIFY)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Number of Staff (FTE)	Unit/Staff #5	Unit/Staff #6	Unit/Staff #7	Unit/Staff #8
	_____	_____	_____	_____

# CODES FOR FUNCTIONS

1. DETECTION
  2. REFERRALS
  3. INVESTIGATIONS
  4. CALCULATION
  5. PROSECUTION
  6. ADMIN. DISQUAL. HEARINGS
  7. COLLECTIONS
  8. SUSPENSION
  9. FOLLOW-UP ON DELINQUENT CLAIMS
  10. TERMINATION
  11. MANAGEMENT
  12. OTHER
- (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

	Unit/Staff #9	Unit/Staff #10	Unit/Staff #11	Unit/Staff #12
Name of Unit/Staff	_____	_____	_____	_____
Agency	_____	_____	_____	_____
Functions	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____

	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Handles:								
Fraud	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Nonfraud	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0

	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Handles:								
AFDC	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
GA	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Medical	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Other	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
(SPECIFY)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Number of Staff (FTE)	_____	_____	_____	_____

CODES FOR FUNCTIONS

1. DETECTION
2. REFERRALS
3. INVESTIGATIONS
4. CALCULATION
5. PROSECUTION
6. ADMIN. DISQUAL. HEARINGS
7. COLLECTIONS
8. SUSPENSION
9. FOLLOW-UP ON DELINQUENT CLAIMS
10. TERMINATION
11. MANAGEMENT
12. OTHER  
(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

In organizing this discussion of the claims process, we have identified six steps or stages. In order to be sure that we are (both/all) talking about the same things, I would like to briefly summarize those stages for you.

The first stage we have identified is the claim referral process. We view this as including the detection of the overissuance and the formal steps by which the claims process is initiated.

The second stage of the process we have identified is the claim investigation. This stage would include the calculation of the total amount of the overissuance, the determination of the nature of the error (i.e., administrative error, inadvertent household error, or intentional program violation), and investigation into the circumstances of the error.

The third stage of the process is claim establishment. Claim establishment for nonfraud claims would include the decision to collect on the claim and the process by which the client is informed of that decision. For fraud claims, claim establishment would include the decision to use prosecution, disqualification consent agreements, administrative disqualification hearings, or a waiver of hearing to confirm the allegation of fraud and the process used in setting up the framework for collecting on the claim.

The fourth stage of the claims process is the collection of payments on the claim. This would include setting up the claim for repayment, the use of demand letters, and the procedures for tracking claim payments and recoupments.

The fifth stage of the claims process is the follow-up activities used for delinquent claims. This stage includes the identification of delinquent claims and the use of alternative collection methods, such as wage garnishment or tax refund intercepts.

The final stage of the claims process which we have identified is claim suspension and termination. This stage includes the identification of claims which are eligible for suspension and termination and the processes whereby those actions are taken.

Are these stages clear to you and do they make sense as a framework for discussing the claims process of your agency?

EMPHASIZE THE NEED TO USE THE STAGES AS WE HAVE DEFINED THEM IN ORDER TO BE CONSISTENT IN OUR DESCRIPTION OF CLAIM SYSTEMS.

1.02a COMPLETE THIS QUESTION PRIOR TO THE INTERVIEW BASED UPON INFORMATION PROVIDED IN QUESTION 1.00 OF THE STATE CENSUS.

FOR THOSE STAGES OF THE CLAIMS PROCESS CARRIED OUT AT THE FIELD OR LOCAL/COUNTY OFFICE LEVEL, CIRCLE THE ASSOCIATED NUMBER IN THE "ADDITIONAL MODULES TO ADMINISTER" COLUMN.

NOTE: A REGIONAL OFFICE IS AN ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL BETWEEN THE LOCAL AND STATE OFFICE.

	<u>FIELD OFFICE</u>	<u>LOCAL/ COUNTY OFFICE</u>	<u>REGIONAL OFFICE</u>	<u>STATE FSA</u>	<u>STATE WELFARE AGENCY</u>	<u>OTHER AGENCY (SPECIFY)</u>	<u>ADDITIONAL MODULES TO ADMINISTER</u>
a. Claim referral?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Claim investigations?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	5
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Establishment of the claim?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	6
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Collection of claim payments?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	7
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
e. Follow-up activities on delinquent claims?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	8
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
f. Claim suspension and termination?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	9
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

Based upon our discussions with staff at the state Food Stamp Agency, we understand that the local agency responsibilities include: (SUMMARIZE RELEVANT STAGES OF CLAIMS PROCESS WHICH ARE AT FIELD OFFICE OR LOCAL/COUNTY LEVEL), while the state (OR REGIONAL) office handles: (SUMMARIZE RELEVANT STAGES OF CLAIMS PROCESS WHICH ARE AT STATE OR REGIONAL LEVEL). Is this a correct overview of the organizational level at which the claims activities in your state are carried out?

YES.....(GO TO 1.03).....1  
NO.....0

1.02b MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE GRID BELOW TO REFLECT RESPONDENT'S COMMENTS.

FOR THOSE STAGES OF THE CLAIMS PROCESS CARRIED OUT AT THE FIELD OR LOCAL/COUNTY OFFICE LEVEL, CIRCLE THE ASSOCIATED NUMBER IN THE "ADDITIONAL MODULES TO ADMINISTER" COLUMN.

NOTE: A REGIONAL OFFICE IS AN ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL BETWEEN THE LOCAL AND STATE OFFICE.

	<u>FIELD OFFICE</u>	<u>LOCAL/ COUNTY OFFICE</u>	<u>REGIONAL OFFICE</u>	<u>STATE FSA</u>	<u>STATE WELFARE AGENCY</u>	<u>OTHER AGENCY (SPECIFY)</u>	<u>ADDITIONAL MODULES TO ADMINISTER</u>
a. Claim referral?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Claim investigations?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	5
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Establishment of the claim?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	6
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Collection of claim payments?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	7
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
e. Follow-up activities on delinquent claims?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	8
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
f. Claim suspension and termination?							
FRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	9
NONFRAUD	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

- 1.03 We would like to talk with you about those stages of the claims process which are handled by your agency.

The interview will include sections on the administration of the claims process, methods used in monitoring overissuances and claims, overissuance identification, and (LIST ADDITIONAL MODULE TOPICS).

NOTE: ALL RESPONDENTS WILL BE ASKED MODULES 1-4 AND 10.

Is any part of the claims process for Food Stamps integrated with the claims processes of other assistance programs, such as AFDC, Medicaid, or GA? That is, does the same staff unit handle claims for Food Stamps and other programs?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 2).....0

1.04 Which other programs are integrated with Food Stamps claims at the stage of:  
(CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>AFDC</u>	<u>MEDICAID</u>	<u>GA</u>	<u>OTHER PROGRAM (SPECIFY)</u>
a. Claim referrals?	1	1	1	_____
b. Claim investigations?	1	1	1	_____
c. Establishment of claims?	1	1	1	_____
d. Collection of claim payments?				
RECOUPMENT	1*	1	1	_____
OTHER METHODS	1	1	1	_____
e. Follow-up activities on delinquent claims?	1	1	1	_____
f. Claim suspension and termination?	1	1	1	_____

\*1.05 ASK IF FSP AND AFDC ARE INTEGRATED. How is the recoupment for Food Stamps and AFDC linked? Is it the: (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
a. Same staff?	1	0
b. Same unit?	1	0
c. Same automated system?	1	0
d. Other?	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____		

REQUIRED MODULE

MODULE 2: ADMINISTRATION CONTROL

There are a variety of ways that an agency can manage the claims process. We are interested in the management methods used by your agency.

2.00 Does your agency produce routine summary reports which assess how well the claims system is working?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 2.02).....0



2.01 Do those summary reports include reports on activities at the various stages of the claims process? That is, are there summary reports concerning: (CIRCLE "1" or "0" UNDER "REPORTS" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

(IF YES, ASK:) Is the preparation of those reports automated? How frequently are those reports prepared? Who receives the report? (MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE FOR "WHO RECEIVES?".)

	REPORTS?		AUTOMATED?		FREQUENCY?	WHO RECEIVES?
	YES	NO	YES	NO		
a. Claim referrals?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
b. Claim investigations?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
c. Establishment of claims?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
d. Collection of claim payments?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
e. Follow-up activities on delinquent claims?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
f. Claim suspensions and terminations?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	11	11 11 11

CODES FOR FREQUENCY

1. LESS THAN MONTHLY
2. LESS THAN MONTHLY AND MONTHLY
3. MONTHLY
4. QUARTERLY
5. SEMI-ANNUALLY
6. ANNUALLY
7. IRREGULAR
8. OTHER  
(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

CODES FOR WHO RECEIVES

1. CASEWORKER
2. CW SUPERVISOR
3. CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL
4. FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL
5. INVESTIGATION UNIT: LOCAL
6. RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL
7. CLAIMS CONSULTANT
8. FRAUD CONSULTANT
9. INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST
10. RECOVERY SPECIALIST
11. OTHER  
(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

2.02 Are the relevant workers provided with training specifically related to the claims process?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 2.05).....0

2.03 Does this training in the claims process include:  
(CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
a. Training for new hires?	1	0
b. Scheduled refresher training for existing staff?	1	0
c. Retraining as needed (for example, following a rule change)?	1	0

2.04 Where is the emphasis placed in the training? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

PROCEDURES FOR CLAIM REFERRALS.....1  
DETECTION OF OVERISSUANCES.....1  
PREVENTION OF OVERISSUANCES.....1  
INVESTIGATIONS.....1  
REGULATIONS/LAWS.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

2.05 Are there written manuals available to the staff which provide detailed information on the policies and procedures of the claims process?

YES.....1  
NO.....0

2.06 Do you have any time limits which control how long workers have to complete the steps involved in the processing of the claim?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 3).....0

2.07

Are there established time limits for:  
(CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

(IF YES, ASK:) What is the time limit for (STAGE OF PROCESS)? What is the starting event for the time limit? What percent of cases are you able to process within that time limit?

	TIME LIMITS?		DAYS FROM		PERCENT
	YES	NO	STARTING EVENT?		
a. Making a claim referral?					
FRAUD	1	0		FROM	
NONFRAUD	1	0		FROM	
b. Completing claim investigations?					
FRAUD	1	0		FROM	
NONFRAUD	1	0		FROM	
c. Establishing the claim?					
FRAUD	1	0		FROM	
NONFRAUD	1	0		FROM	
d. Completing follow-up activities on a delinquent claim?					
FRAUD	1	0		FROM	
NONFRAUD	1	0		FROM	
e. Suspending the claim?					
FRAUD	1	0		FROM	
NONFRAUD	1	0		FROM	

CODES FOR STARTING EVENT

1. DETECTION
  2. REFERRAL
  3. ESTABLISHMENT
  4. FAILURE TO PAY
  5. OTHER
- (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

REQUIRED MODULE

**MODULE 3: CLAIMS MONITORING**

Now I would like to talk with you about the processes and procedures that you have for monitoring overissuances and claims.

3.00 Is any part of your claims process automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 3.09).....0

3.01 Is any part of the food stamp certification system also automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 3.03).....0

3.02 Does your automated claims system have access to the household eligibility file used by the automated certification system?

YES.....1  
NO.....0

3.03 Does your automated system calculate the amount of the overissuance?

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
YES.....	1	1
NO....(GO TO 3.05 IF "NO"		
FOR BOTH).....	0	0

3.04 How far back does the automated system permit the overissuance to be calculated?

MONTHS.....|\_|\_|

3.05 Are the calculations and deductions for recoupment automated? Does the system generate demand letters? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

NOTE: WE ARE NOT CONCERNED WITH WHICH AUTOMATED SYSTEM DOES THESE FUNCTIONS.

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
CALCULATIONS:		
FRAUD.....	1	0
NONFRAUD.....	1	0
DEDUCTIONS:		
FRAUD.....	1	0
NONFRAUD.....	1	0
DEMAND LETTERS:		
FRAUD.....	1	0
NONFRAUD.....	1	0

3.06 Do you maintain an automated history for the dates of actions taken on overissuances or claims?

YES.....	1
NO.....(GO TO 3.09).....	0

3.07 What is the starting point for that automated history? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

DETECTION.....	1
REFERRAL.....	2
ESTABLISHMENT.....	3
COLLECTIONS.....	4
FAILURE TO PAY.....	5
SUSPENSION.....	6
OTHER.....	7

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

3.08 Does that automated history include the:  
(CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	NONFRAUD		FRAUD	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Dates of actions taken on overissuances and claims?				
DATES OF ALL ACTIONS	1	0	1	0
DATE OF LATEST ACTION	1	0	1	0
OTHER	1	0	1	0
(SPECIFY) _____				
b. Dates of claim payments through recoupment?	1	0	1	0
c. Dates of other types of claim payments?	1	0	1	0
d. Amounts of claim payments?	1	0	1	0
e. Date of claim suspension?	1	0	1	0

3.09 Do you have an established process (either manual or automated) for tracking individual overissuances or claims?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 3.11).....0

3.10 Does your process for monitoring claims include the tracking of:  
(CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

(IF YES, ASK:) Is that tracking automated?

	TRACKING?		AUTOMATED?	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Claim referrals?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
b. Claim investigations?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
c. Established claims?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
d. Claim payments?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
e. Suspended claims?				
FRAUD	1	0	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0
f. Individuals disqualified because of fraud claims?	1	0	1	0
g. Computer match hits?	1	0	1	0
h. Other apparent overissuances?	1	0	1	0

3.11 Do you have a system for signaling workers that a household case has an overissuance or claim which requires further action by the agency?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 3.13).....0

3.12 For which types of cases are workers signaled that further action is needed? That is, for which types of cases do you have flags?  
(READ THE LIST AND CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

(IF YES, ASK:) Are the flags automated? Who is alerted by the flags?  
(MULTIPLE ANSWERS ARE POSSIBLE.) Are the flags permanently attached to the case, that is, are they carried on the records of households that are no longer participating in the program so that the flags are visible to staff if the household reapplies?

	FLAGS?		AUTOMATED?		WHO'S ALERTED?	PERMANENT?	
	YES	NO	YES	NO		YES	NO
Fraud referrals	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
Nonfraud referrals	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
Cases with active claims	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
Cases with delinquent claims	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
Cases with suspended claims	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
Case with disqualified Individuals	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
Other (SPECIFY) _____	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0

CODES FOR WHO'S ALERTED

1. CASEWORKER
2. CW SUPERVISOR
3. CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL
4. FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL
5. INVESTIGATION UNIT: LOCAL
6. RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL
7. CLAIMS CONSULTANT
8. FRAUD CONSULTANT
9. INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST
10. RECOVERY SPECIALIST
11. OTHER  
(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

3.13 Do you produce routine reports on the status of individual cases with overissuances and claims?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 3.15).....0



3.14 Do these reports include status reports on individual cases with:  
(CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

(IF YES, ASK:) Is the preparation of these reports automated? How frequently are those reports prepared? Who receives these reports? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES ARE POSSIBLE FOR "WHO RECEIVES?".)

	REPORTS?		AUTOMATED?		FREQUENCY?	WHO RECEIVES?
	YES	NO	YES	NO		
a. Claim referrals?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Established claims?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Delinquent claims?						
FRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
NONFRAUD	1	0	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

CODES FOR FREQUENCY

1. LESS THAN MONTHLY
2. LESS THAN MONTHLY AND MONTHLY
3. MONTHLY
4. QUARTERLY
5. SEMI-ANNUALLY
6. ANNUALLY
7. IRREGULAR
8. OTHER

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

CODES FOR WHO RECEIVES

1. CASEWORKER
2. CW SUPERVISOR
3. CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL
4. FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL
5. INVESTIGATION UNIT: LOCAL
6. RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL
7. CLAIMS CONSULTANT
8. FRAUD CONSULTANT
9. INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST
10. RECOVERY SPECIALIST
11. OTHER

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

3.15 Do you have an established process for sorting and reporting on overissuances and claims by their chronological ages?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 4).....0

3.16

Does your process for aging overissuances and claims involve keeping track of the ages of:  
(CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

(IF YES, ASK:) What is the starting event? Is the aging automated?

NOTE: THE "STARTING EVENT" IS THE EVENT WHICH IS USED AS THE BASIS FOR AGING.

	AGING?		STARTING	AUTOMATED?	
	YES	NO	EVENT?	YES	NO
a. Apparent overissuances?	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
b. Claim referrals?					
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
c. Claim investigations?					
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
d. Delinquent claims?					
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
e. Suspended claims?					
FRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0
NONFRAUD	1	0	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1	0

CODES FOR EVENT

1. DETECTION
2. REFERRAL
3. ESTABLISHMENT
4. FAILURE TO PAY
5. SUSPENSION
6. OTHER  
(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

REQUIRED MODULE

MODULE 4: CLAIM REFERRAL

Now I would like to talk about the first stage of the claims process--claim referral.

4.00 Which of the following methods are used in the identification of over-issuances: (READ LIST OF METHODS AND CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

How would you rank the detection methods used in order of their importance? (By importance, I mean responsible for identifying the most overissuances.)

(RANK EACH METHOD USED.)

	USED?		RANKING
	YES	NO	
a. QC reviews?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
b. Recertification review?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
c. Computer matching of wages?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
d. Computer matching of unearned income?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

f. Duplicate participation checks?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
g. Special investigation units?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
h. Internal audits?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
i. Error prone profile?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
j. Hotline, "whistleblowing" or informal complaints?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
k. Information from other agencies?	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

OPTIONAL MODULE

**MODULE 5: CLAIM INVESTIGATIONS**

5.00 IS THIS MODULE REQUIRED? (REFER TO PAGE 6 OR 7.)

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 6).....0

Moving on to the stage of claim investigations, I would like to ask you about the processes for the calculation of the overissuance amount, the determination of the nature of the error, and any investigations into the circumstances of the error. Would you briefly describe the process for investigating fraud and nonfraud claims used in your agency?

NOTES:

5.01 There are two broad categories of claim referrals: referrals for nonfraud errors and referrals for suspected fraud. Does your agency place more emphasis upon the investigation and establishment of fraud claims than upon the investigation and establishment of nonfraud claims? IF NO, PROBE FOR WHETHER THE EMPHASIS IS THE OTHER WAY--NONFRAUD OVER FRAUD CLAIMS. (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

NO DIFFERENCE.....(GO TO 5.03).....1  
FRAUD OVER NONFRAUD.....2  
NONFRAUD OVER FRAUD.....3

5.02 Would you tell me about your agency's emphasis for claim investigation and establishment and the reasons behind those policies? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

PROTECT INTEGRITY OF PROGRAM.....1  
DETERRENT FOR POTENTIAL FRAUD.....1  
EASIER TO ESTABLISH NONFRAUD.....1  
RECOVER MORE DOLLARS.....1  
FNS INCENTIVES.....1  
FRAUD INVESTIGATIONS/ESTABLISHMENT EXPENSIVE.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

5.03 Who is generally responsible for investigating the circumstances of the overissuances for nonfraud cases? For cases of suspected fraud? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
CASEWORKER.....	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

5.04 Is the overissuance amount calculated for every case in which there is an overissuance or do you dismiss some cases before doing the work-up?

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
ALWAYS CALCULATED..(GO TO 5.06 IF "1" FOR BOTH).....	1	1
NOT ALWAYS CALCULATED.....	0	0

5.05 When is the overissuance amount not calculated? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

CANNOT GET INFORMATION.....	1
CANNOT IDENTIFY PROBLEM.....	1
ERROR IS OLD.....	1
APPEARS TO BE LESS THAN \$35.....	1
NOT ENOUGH TIME FOR ALL OVERISSUANCES.....	1
OTHER.....	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5.06 How far back do you go in calculating the amount of the overissuance?

	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (AE)</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (HE)</u>
YEARS.....	____	____	____
DATE OF ERROR.....	98	98	98
NO GUIDELINE.....	99	99	99

5.07 Does the investigation include searching for other possible sources of error and/or fraud in addition to that which has been discovered?

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
YES.....	1	1
NO.....	0	0

5.08 Focusing on nonfraud cases, what steps or methods are typically used in conducting an investigation of a nonfraud case? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

(FOR EACH METHOD USED, ASK:) Is/are (METHOD) always used? (IF NOT ALWAYS USED, ASK:) In what percentage of nonfraud cases is/are (METHOD) used? What (does its/do their) use depend upon?

	<u>USED?</u>		<u>ALWAYS?</u>		<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>DEPENDS ON</u>
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>OF CASES</u>	
CASE FILE REVIEW	1	0	1	0	_ _	_ _
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW	1	0	1	0	_ _	_ _
IN-OFFICE INTERVIEW	1	0	1	0	_ _	_ _
HOME VISIT	1	0	1	0	_ _	_ _
THIRD-PARTY CONTACTS	1	0	1	0	_ _	_ _
OTHER	1	0	1	0	_ _	_ _

(SPECIFY) |\_|\_|

CODES FOR DEPENDS ON

1. RESPONSIVENESS OF CLIENT
2. NATURE OF PROBLEM
3. AVAILABILITY OF WITNESSES
4. NEED FOR EVIDENCE
5. OTHER

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

5.09 Are there established policies or procedures for determining which of the claims referred for nonfraud errors will be most actively pursued (INVESTIGATED) prior to claim establishment? This would include any policies for prioritizing cases when there is a backlog of claim referrals to be processed?

YES.....	1
NO....(GO TO 5.14).....	0

- 5.10 In setting up these priorities for nonfraud cases, what characteristics of a case would increase the likelihood of that case being pursued (INVESTIGATED) prior to claim establishment? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

AGE OF CLIENT.....1  
PHYSICAL/MENTAL STATE OF CLIENT.....1  
PA HOUSEHOLD.....1  
HOUSEHOLD ERROR.....1  
RECENT ERROR.....1  
ACTIVE CASE.....1  
LARGE DOLLAR AMOUNT.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 5.11 What are the reasons behind these policies?  
(CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

COLLECT MORE MONEY.....1  
EASIEST TO ESTABLISH.....1  
EASIEST TO COLLECT.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 5.12 How is the prioritizing of cases done? PROBE, IF NEEDED--Is there a very structured scoring of cases based on the dimensions you listed or is it a more informal process intended to provide only general guidelines? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

RIGOROUS SCORING.....1  
GENERAL GUIDELINES.....(GO TO 5.14).....2  
OTHER.....(GO TO 5.14).....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

- 5.13 Is this scoring of cases automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....0

- 5.14 At the conclusion of the investigation of nonfraud referrals, who generally makes the decision that a claim should be established? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

CASEWORKER.....1  
CW SUPERVISOR.....1  
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....1  
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....1  
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.15 Now let's talk about cases of suspected fraud.

Who is generally responsible for the initial decision to refer an overissuance case for fraud investigation? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

CASEWORKER.....1  
CW SUPERVISOR.....1  
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....1  
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....1  
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.16 At what stage in the claims process is that decision typically made? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

IN CONJUNCTION WITH CLAIM REFERRAL.....1  
AS PART OF INVESTIGATION FOLLOWING REFERRAL.....2  
AFTER INVESTIGATION.....3  
OTHER.....4

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.17 What percent of overissuances are referred for fraud investigations?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|



5.18 What steps or methods are typically used in conducting an investigation of a case of suspected fraud? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

(FOR EACH METHOD USED, ASK:) Is/are (METHOD) always used? (IF NOT ALWAYS USED, ASK:) In what percentage of suspected fraud cases is/are (METHOD) used? What (does its/do their) use depend upon?

	USED?		ALWAYS?		PERCENT OF CASES	DEPENDS ON
	YES	NO	YES	NO		
CASE FILE REVIEW	1	0	1	0	100	
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW	1	0	1	0	100	
IN-OFFICE INTERVIEW	1	0	1	0	100	
HOME VISIT	1	0	1	0	100	
THIRD-PARTY CONTACTS	1	0	1	0	100	
INTERVIEW WITNESSES	1	0	1	0	100	
FORENSIC INVESTIGATION	1	0	1	0	100	
OTHER	1	0	1	0	100	

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

CODES FOR DEPENDS ON

1. RESPONSIVENESS OF CLIENT
2. NATURE OF PROBLEM
3. AVAILABILITY OF WITNESSES
4. NEED FOR EVIDENCE
5. OTHER

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

5.19 Are there established policies or procedures for determining which of the claims referred for suspected fraud will be most actively pursued (INVESTIGATED) prior to claim establishment? This would include any policies for prioritizing cases when there is a backlog of claim referrals to be processed?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 5.24).....0

- 5.20 In setting up these priorities for suspected fraud cases, what characteristics of a case would increase the likelihood of that case being pursued (INVESTIGATED) as suspected fraud prior to claim establishment? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

AGE OF CLIENT.....1  
PHYSICAL/MENTAL STATE OF CLIENT.....1  
PA HOUSEHOLD.....1  
RECENT ERROR.....1  
ACTIVE CASE.....1  
LARGE DOLLAR AMOUNT.....1  
QUALITY OF EVIDENCE.....1  
REPEAT OFFENDER.....1  
FLAGRANT VIOLATION.....1  
FRAUD IN MULTIPLE PROGRAMS.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.21 What are the reasons behind these policies?  
(CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

COLLECT MORE MONEY.....1  
EASIEST TO ESTABLISH.....1  
EASIEST TO COLLECT.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.22 How is the prioritizing of cases done? PROBE, IF NEEDED--Is there a very structured scoring of cases based on the dimensions you listed or is it a more informal process intended to provide only general guidelines? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

RIGOROUS SCORING.....1  
GENERAL GUIDELINES....(GO TO 5.24).....2  
OTHER.....(GO TO 5.24).....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

- 5.23 Is this scoring of cases automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....0

- 5.24 Who is generally responsible for the initial decision to pursue a case of suspected fraud as a fraud claim? That is, who determines that a particular case merits the extra effort required to confirm the fraud allegation? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

CASEWORKER.....1  
CW SUPERVISOR.....1  
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....1  
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....1  
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

- 5.25 What factors enter into that decision? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

AVAILABLE STAFF TIME.....1  
QUALITY OF EVIDENCE.....1  
FLAGRANT VIOLATION.....1  
LARGE DOLLAR AMOUNT.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 5.26 How is a fraud referral handled after it has been decided not to pursue it as a fraud claim?

PROCESSED AS NONFRAUD CLAIM.....1  
OTHER.....2

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

OPTIONAL MODULE

**MODULE 6: CLAIM ESTABLISHMENT**

6.00 IS THIS MODULE REQUIRED? (REFER TO PAGE 6 OR 7.)

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 7).....0

The next stage of the claims process to be discussed is claim establishment.

6.01 For cases of suspected fraud, which of the following methods are used to establish the claim? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

How would you rank the methods used in order of their frequency of use?  
(RANK EACH METHOD USED.)

	USED?		<u>RANKING</u>
	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	
a. Prosecution	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
b. Disqualification consent agreement	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
c. Administrative disqualifi- cation hearing	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
d. Waiver of hearing	1	0	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

6.02 IF ANY OF THE METHODS OF 6.01 ARE NOT USED, ASK--What are the reasons for not using (METHOD NOT USED)?

NOTES:

<u>METHOD</u>	<u>REASON</u>
<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

6.03 Who makes the decision about which of the methods will be used to establish a fraud claim? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

CASEWORKER.....1  
CW SUPERVISOR.....1  
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....1  
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....1  
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....1  
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

6.04 What are the most important factors leading to a case being referred for prosecution as opposed to one of the other methods? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

ALL FRAUD PROSECUTED.....1  
NONRESPONSIVE HOUSEHOLD.....1  
LARGE DOLLAR AMOUNT.....1  
REPEAT OFFENDER.....1  
FLAGRANT VIOLATION.....1  
QUALITY OF EVIDENCE.....1  
FRAUD IN MULTIPLE PROGRAMS.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6.05 What is the role of the prosecutor's office in determining which cases are referred for prosecution? For example, are there specific guidelines as to which cases the prosecutor's office will take? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

GUIDELINES.....1  
SCREENS ALL CASES.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6.06 Prior to the establishment of the fraud claim, how are the overissuances due to suspected fraud handled? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

NO ACTION TAKEN.....1  
 PROCESSED AS NONFRAUD.....2  
 OTHER.....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

6.07 Earlier we talked about the decision to establish a claim for a nonfraud referral and the decision to pursue a case of suspected fraud as a fraud claim. Is there a process whereby management or staff at a higher level than the persons making those decisions review those decisions?

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
YES.....	1	1
NO.....(GO TO 6.10 IF "0" FOR <u>BOTH</u> NONFRAUD AND FRAUD)...	0	0

6.08 Are all decisions reviewed, or only a random sample of the decisions, or is some other method used for selecting which decisions to review? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
NO REVIEW.....	1	1
ALL ACTIONS.....	2	2
RANDOM SAMPLE.....	3	3
OTHER.....	4	4

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

6.09 Who is responsible for reviewing the decisions? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
CASEWORKER.....	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

6.10

For nonfraud claims, who is responsible for notifying the household of the claim (i.e., mailing the demand letter or arranging for the demand letter to be mailed)? And for fraud claims, who is responsible for notifying the household of the claim? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD (COURT)</u>	<u>FRAUD (OTHER)</u>
CASEWORKER.....	1	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1
RECOVERY SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

OPTIONAL MODULE

**MODULE 7: COLLECTION OF PAYMENTS**

7.00      IS THIS MODULE REQUIRED? (REFER TO PAGE 6 OR 7.)

YES.....1

NO.....(GO TO MODULE 8).....0

I would now like to talk with you about the policies and procedures for recovering the claim once collection actions have been initiated. This stage of the claims process--claim collections--includes setting up the claim for repayment, the use of demand letters, and the use of recoupment. Would you briefly describe the way your collection process works?

NOTES:

7.01      Who is generally responsible for making arrangements with the household on the payment of a nonfraud claim? What about for a fraud claim?  
(CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD (COURT)</u>	<u>FRAUD (OTHER)</u>
CASEWORKER.....	1	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1
RECOVERY SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_



- 7.02 For nonfraud claims, who has responsibility for identifying households which fail to respond to the initial demand letter? What about for fraud claims? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD (COURT)</u>	<u>FRAUD (OTHER)</u>
NO DEMAND LETTER.....	1	1	1
CASEWORKER.....	1	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1
RECOVERY SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

- 7.03 For nonfraud claims, how frequently are follow-up demand letters mailed to households once the claim is established? What about for fraud claims? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE REPOSE IN EACH COLUMN.)

	<u>NONFRAUD (IHE)</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (AE)</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
MONTHLY.....	1	1	1
NO FIXED SCHEDULE.....	2	2	2
OTHER.....	3	3	3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

- 7.04 Is there some standard for how many letters are mailed for a nonfraud claim if the household does not respond? What about for a fraud claim?

	<u>NONFRAUD (IHE)</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (AE)</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
NUMBER OF LETTERS.....	_____	_____	_____
VARIES BY VALUE OF CLAIM....	98	98	98
NO STANDARD.....	99	99	99

7.05 Under what circumstances is the household's food stamp allotment reduced through recoupment? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

NOT ROUTINELY USED.....1  
AGENCY ERROR IF CLIENT CONSENTS.....1  
HOUSEHOLD ERROR.....1  
FRAUD.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

**OPTIONAL MODULE**

**MODULE 8: FOLLOW-UP FOR DELINQUENT CLAIMS**

8.00 IS THIS MODULE REQUIRED? (REFER TO PAGE 6 OR 7.)

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 9).....0

I would now like to talk with you about the follow-up activities used by your agency for delinquent claims.

8.01 What methods (other than demand letters) are used to notify households of delinquent claims? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD (IHE)</u>	<u>NONFRAUD (AE)</u>	<u>FRAUD (COURT)</u>	<u>FRAUD (OTHER)</u>
NONE.....	1	1	1	1
MONTHLY BILLING (SEPARATE FROM DEMAND LETTER).....	1	1	1	1
LATE PAYMENT LETTER.....	1	1	1	1
PHONE CALLS.....	1	1	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

8.02 Does your agency use any alternative collections methods, for example, tax refund intercepts, collection agencies, or wage garnishment, to collect on delinquent claims?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 8.10a).....0

8.03 Which of the following alternative collection methods are used by your agency? (CIRCLE "1" OK "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

How would you rank the alternative collection methods used in order of their frequency of use? (RANK EACH METHOD USED.)

Can you tell me the approximate number of cases for which each collection method was used in FY 1985?

	USED?		IF YES,	ASK--
	YES	NO	RANKING	NUMBER
a. Tax refund intercept	1	0	1	1, 1
b. Wage garnishment	1	0	1	1, 1
c. Property liens	1	0	1	1, 1
d. Small claims court	1	0	1	1, 1
e. Private collection agency	1	0	1	1, 1
f. Credit bureau	1	0	1	1, 1
g. Garnish bank accounts	1	0	1	1, 1
h. Civil actions	1	0	1	1, 1
i. Other	1	0		
(SPECIFY)			1	1, 1
			1	1, 1
			1	1, 1

8.04 Who generally makes the decision to initiate alternative collection actions against households which fail to make payments on their claims? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	NONFRAUD	FRAUD (COURT)	FRAUD (OTHER)
CASEWORKER.....	1	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1
RECOVERY SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1	1

(SPECIFY) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

8.05 Are there established policies or procedures for determining which cases are pursued through the alternative collection methods?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 8.10a).....0

8.06 In determining which cases are to be pursued through alternative collection methods, what characteristics of a case increase the probability of that case being selected? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

PA HOUSEHOLD.....1  
FRAUD CLAIM.....1  
LONG TERM DELINQUENCY.....1  
INACTIVE HOUSEHOLD.....1  
LARGE DOLLAR AMOUNT.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8.07 What are the reasons behind these policies?

NOTES: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8.08 How is the selection of cases carried out? IF NEEDED, PROBE--Is it a very structured scoring of cases based on the dimensions you have listed or is it a more informal process intended to provide only general guidelines? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

RIGOROUS SCORING.....1  
GENERAL GUIDELINES..(GO TO 8.10a)....2  
OTHER.....(GO TO 8.10a)....3

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

8.09 Is this sorting of cases automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....0



OPTIONAL MODULE

**MODULE 9: SUSPENSION/TERMINATION OF CLAIMS**

9.00 IS THIS MODULE REQUIRED? (REFER TO PAGE 6 OR 7.)

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO MODULE 10).....0

Now, I would like to talk with you about how the agency reaches the decision that it is no longer worthwhile to pursue an outstanding claim.

9.01 Who is generally responsible for identifying claims which should be considered for suspension? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
CASEWORKER.....	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
FINANCIAL UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1
RECOVERY SPECIALIST.....	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

9.02 Is there a review of delinquent claims to determine which ones should be suspended?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 9.06).....0

9.03 Is this review automated?

YES.....1  
NO.....0

9.04 What percent of delinquent claims are reviewed? Of those claims that are reviewed, what percent are suspended?

PERCENT REVIEWED.....|\_|\_|

PERCENT SUSPENDED.....|\_|\_|

9.05 How effective is this review process in reducing the backlog of delinquent claims? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE.)

VERY EFFECTIVE.....1  
SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE.....2  
NOT EFFECTIVE.....3  
OTHER.....4

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

9.06 Are there claims which qualify for suspension but are not suspended?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 9.08).....0

9.07 Why are they not suspended? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

LACK OF STAFF.....1  
CONTINUE TO PURSUE.....1  
LEGAL RESTRICTIONS ON SUSPENDING DEBT.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|  
\_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|

9.08 Who is responsible for determining that a claim should be suspended? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
CASEWORKER.....	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
FINANCIAL UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1
RECOVERY SPECIALIST.....	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_|\_|\_|\_|\_|



9.09 What documentation is required in order to suspend a claim?

NOTES:


9.10 Do you have a procedure for reactivating suspended claims?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 9.12).....0

9.11 Under what circumstances would a suspended claim be reactivated?  
(CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

DO NOT REACTIVATE.....1  
HOUSEHOLD REAPPLIES.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9.12 Are there established policies or procedures for determining when  
suspended claims should be terminated?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 9.14).....0

9.13 What are the criteria for terminating a suspended claim? (CIRCLE "1"  
FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

CLAIM SUSPENDED FOR 3 YEARS.....1  
DEATH.....1  
BANKRUPTCY.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9.14 Who is responsible for determining that a suspended claim should be terminated? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
CASEWORKER.....	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1
RECOVERY SPECIALIST.....	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR.....	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

9.15 After claims have been suspended, do you ever keep them on the books for more than three years?

YES.....1  
NO....(GO TO 9.18).....0

9.16 For how long do you generally retain suspended claims on the books?

	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
INDEFINITELY.....	99	99
YEARS.....	____	____

9.17 What are the reasons for carrying the claims longer than the required three years? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

LACK OF STAFF.....1  
CONTINUED PURSUIT.....1  
LEGAL RESTRICTIONS ON TERMINATING DEBT.....1  
STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR CARRYING.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 9.18 Earlier we talked about the decision to suspend a claim and the decision to terminate a claim. Is there a process by which management or staff at a higher level than the person making those decisions review those decisions? (CIRCLE "1" OR "0" FOR ALL ITEMS.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
SUSPENDED:		
FRAUD.....	1	0
NONFRAUD.....	1	0
TERMINATED:		
FRAUD.....	1	0
NONFRAUD.....	1	0

IF ALL RESPONSES ARE "NO", GO TO MODULE 10.

- 9.19 Are all decisions reviewed, or only a random sample of the decisions, or is some other method used to select decisions to review? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH.)

	<u>ALL DECISIONS</u>	<u>RANDOM SAMPLE</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>(SPECIFY)</u>
SUSPENDED:				
FRAUD	1	2	3	_____
NONFRAUD	1	2	3	_____
TERMINATED:				
FRAUD	1	2	3	_____
NONFRAUD	1	2	3	_____

9.20 Who is responsible for reviewing those decisions? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

	SUSPENSIONS		TERMINATIONS	
	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>	<u>NONFRAUD</u>	<u>FRAUD</u>
CASEWORKER.....	1	1	1	1
CW SUPERVISOR.....	1	1	1	1
CLAIMS UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1	1
FRAUD UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1	1
RECOVERY UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1	1
INVESTIGATIONS UNIT: LOCAL...	1	1	1	1
FINANCIAL UNIT: LOCAL.....	1	1	1	1
CLAIMS CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1	1
FRAUD CONSULTANT.....	1	1	1	1
INVESTIGATION SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1	1
RECOVERY SPECIALIST.....	1	1	1	1
LEGAL AUTHORITY/PROSECUTOR....	1	1	1	1
AUTOMATED SYSTEM.....	1	1	1	1
OTHER.....	1	1	1	1

(SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

REQUIRED MODULE

MODULE 10: MAGNITUDE OF OVERISSUANCES AND CLAIMS

I would now like to ask you some questions about the magnitude of the overissuances and claims problems that your claims system is addressing.

10.00 Do you maintain information on the number of overissuances identified and claim referrals received in FY 1985?

YES.....1  
NO.....(GO TO 10.01).....0

a. How many overissuances were identified in FY 1985? What was the dollar value of those overissuances?

OVERISSUANCES.....| | | , | | | , | | |  
DOLLAR VALUE.....| | | , | | | , | | |

b. How many claim referrals were made in FY 1985? What was the dollar value of those referrals?

REFERRALS.....| | | , | | | , | | |  
DOLLAR VALUE.....| | | , | | | , | | |

c. Of the claims referrals that were made in FY 1985, how many were established as claims in FY 1985? What was the dollar value of these claims?

ESTABLISHED CLAIMS.....| | | , | | | , | | |  
DOLLAR VALUE.....| | | , | | | , | | |

d. Of the total number of claims that were established in FY 1985, how many had any collections made in FY 1985? What was the initial value of those claims? How much was actually collected?

CLAIMS WITH COLLECTIONS...| | | , | | | , | | |  
INITIAL VALUE OF CLAIMS...| | | , | | | , | | |  
DOLLARS COLLECTED.....| | | , | | | , | | |

- e. Of the total number of claims that were established in FY 1985, how many were suspended in FY 1985? What was the initial dollar value of these suspended claims? How much is still unpaid?

SUSPENDED CLAIMS.....|\_|\_|\_|, |\_|\_|\_|, |\_|\_|\_|

INITIAL VALUE OF CLAIMS...|\_|\_|\_|, |\_|\_|\_|, |\_|\_|\_|

STILL UNPAID.....|\_|\_|\_|, |\_|\_|\_|, |\_|\_|\_|

10.01 What would be your professional estimate for the current year or for the last few years of:

- a. The percentage of identified overissuances which result in claim referrals?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|\_|

- b. The percentage of claim referrals which result in established claims?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|\_|

- c. The percentage of claim referrals for suspected fraud which result in established claims for fraud?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|\_|

- d. The percentage of established claims for which at least some collections are made?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|\_|

- e. The percentage of established claims which eventually become delinquent?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|\_|

- f. The percentage of delinquent claims which are suspended?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|\_|

10.02 Many agencies have backlogs of cases to be processed at each stage of the claims system. To help us get an idea of the time required to process cases through the system, would you tell me the approximate number of days required to complete:

- a. The claim referral from the date the overissuance was identified? FROM    TO    DAYS
- b. The establishment of a nonfraud claim from the date of claim referral? FROM    TO    DAYS
- c. The establishment of a fraud claim from the date of claim referral? FROM    TO    DAYS

10.03 What do you see as the reasons for backlogs of overissuances and claims which need to be processed? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

NO BACKLOG FOR NONFRAUD.....1  
NO BACKLOG FOR FRAUD.....1  
LACK OF STAFF.....1  
CLAIMS LOW PRIORITY.....1  
MANUAL SYSTEM.....1  
FRAUD PROCESS SLOW.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY)

10.04 What have you done to address this problem? (CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY.)

NO BACKLOG.....1  
SPECIALIZED STAFF.....1  
SPECIALIZED UNIT.....1  
OTHER.....1

(SPECIFY)

10.05 Finally, I would like some general information about the characteristics of your PA and NPA caseloads. What percentage of the active households in your PA and NPA caseloads have active claims?

PERCENT OF PA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

PERCENT OF NPA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

10.06 What percentage of the active households in your PA and NPA caseloads have suspended claims?

PERCENT OF PA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

PERCENT OF NPA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

10.07 What percentage of the active households in your PA and NPA caseloads are repaying claims through recoupment?

PERCENT OF PA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

PERCENT OF NPA CASELOAD.....|\_|\_|

10.08 Finally, I would like a little information on the AFDC caseload if you have it. What percentage of AFDC cases are repaying AFDC claims through recoupment?

PERCENT.....|\_|\_|